This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Soc
4750
208 A

Soc 4750.208
A
TRANSFERRED
TO
HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY

Oxford Institute of Research

Temperance Without Prohibition

by

Rev. Edward C. Towne

The Institute Press
Worcester and Boston
1908

Copyright by Edward C. Towne, Oxford, Mass.

Soc 4750.208
A
TRANSFERRED
TO
HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY

Oxford Institute of Research

Temperance Without Prohibition

by

Rev. Edward C. Towne

The Institute Press
Worcester and Boston
1908

Copyright by Edward C. Towne, Oxford, Mass.

Anti-prohibition

FROM
THE BUSINESS
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY INC

THE GIFT OF
The Heirs of
George C. Dempsey

OXFORD INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH

T W. P

TEMPERANCE WITHOUT
PROHIBITION

The Crime Against Humanity Of Prohibition Fanaticism:

"SCRIBES, PHARISEES,
AND HYPOCRITES."

An Appeal For Justice.

By REV. EDWARD C. TOWNE.

THE INSTITUTE PRESS
WORCESTER AND BOSTON
1908

Soc 4750.208
A ✓

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
FROM THE HEIRS OF
GEORGE C. DEMPSEY

TO

THE REVERED MEMORY

OF

HENRY CODMAN POTTER, D. D.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL
BISHOP OF NEW YORK.

The Plea in These Pages for

Temperance Without Prohibition

Is Inscribed.

Christian, Scholar, Administrator,

He Applied Conscience and Courage.

To the Just Reformation of

Social Disorder.

BHS
Gift of
The Heirs of
George C. De

CONTENTS.

BOOK FIRST.

Introductory—Bible Counsels on Women, Wine, and Strong Drink: True Origin of Saloon Evils: Social and Church Failure: Dr. John Watson on the True Christian Method: The Cambridge, Lynn, and Worcester Situation.

How Massachusetts Held a Grand Inquest on Prohibition in 1867.

Thirty Thousand Petitioners Demanded "A Judicious License Law."

Plea against Prohibition by Ex-Gov. John A. Andrew.

The Worcester No-License Victory an economic, social and political disaster.

Unjust and Unwise Denial of Freedom.

Unfortunate Physiological Ignorance.

Revival of Calvinistic Fanaticism.

A Crusade Against Justice.

"Scribes, Pharisees, and Hypocrites."

Temperance Progress Hindered by Prohibition.

No-License in Worcester Impossible of Maintenance.

Good City Government the First Necessity for Control of License.

Temperance Secured by Two Agencies:

(1.) Reasonable Regulated Sale.

(2.) Influences by Instruction, Persuasion and varied moral, social and industrial pressure, tending to abstinence or to use strictly regulated by wise restraint.

Two Flagrantly False Ideas:

(1.) Alcohol injurious as Poison in all cases, and

(2.) Moral obligation to strictly prohibit its sale.

BOOK SECOND.

Dr. Carpenter (English Physiologist) Falsely Declares Alcohol in every degree of use "essentially poisonous."

Notably Contradictory Confession Made by Dr. Carpenter.

The Scheme of Nature Provides for the General Use of Alcoholic Stimulants.

Professor — — Johnson ("Chemistry of Comon Life"—Yale Scientific School) Testifies the High Value of Ardent Spirits.

Dr. F. E. Anstie ("Stimulants and Narcotics") Pronounces Alcohol "A Stimulant Food."

Dr. William Brinton ("Food and Digestion") Testifies upon long Medical Experience that Teetotallism Produces Ill Health and Constitutional Debility.

Alcohol "A Most Valuable Medical Food."

Dr. James Jackson (Boston, eminent Practitioner; "Letters to a Young Physician") favors use of "Spirits and Wine."

BOOK THIRD.

Ex-Gov. John A. Andrew's Denial that Drunkenness is the Parent Cause of the Social Evils.

Degredation and Crime Due Rather to Poverty, Physical Depression, Disease, and Social Misery.

Alcoholic Beverages Not Less a Necessity than Tea and Coffee.

Liebig (Great German Chemist) Testified the Special Value of Alcohol as Food.

Exceptional Heating Value of Brandy and Disaster of Total Abstinence Prejudice against its regular use.

Eminent Authorities on The Highly Beneficial Use of Stimulant Drinks.

Prohibition Means Iniquitous Interference with Human Rights.

BOOK FOURTH.

Proper License more Effective than Prohibition.

Rev. Dr. Cyrus Cort on "Prohibition Ineffective."

Cardinal Gibbons Condemns Prohibition.

Ignorant Appeal to Science.

"Free Rum" Under No License:

Worse Liquor and More Drinking.

Fanatical Pulpit Denunciation of A Brewing Corporation.

Shameless Falsification in support of No License.

Teetotal Diet Not Conducive to Sound Health and Long Life.

Exhaustion May Disable the Engineer even worse than Liquor.

How Prohibition Makes Matters Worse.

The English Drink Tradition.

Ministers By Theological Seminary Education Grossly Incompetent for Humane Service.

Beneficial Possibilities of the Saloon: The Saloons which Churches might to great advantage conduct.

Saloon Costs and Saloon Value.

Proposed Substitute for the Saloon.

The Great Problem: Its Wise Solution.

BOOK FIFTH.

Failure of Churches to Attempt Real Temperance Reformation.

Numerous Humane Interests Sacrificed to Sabbatarianism.

Origin of Sabbatarianism Among the Jews.

Denial of Free Sunday More Baneful than the Saloon.

Errors of Rigid Puritanism.

Liberal Character of the Teaching of Jesus.

Churches Based on Separation from Humanity.

Comprehensive Failure of Churches to Minister to Human Need.

Brotherhood Houses Needed More than Church Temples.

BOOK SIXTH.

Temperance Universally Practicable.

Prohibition Pleas not Valid.

Early Church Free Use of Wine.

False cry of "Poison."

Brewers and Allied Trades make Legitimate Protest.

Proposals of National Model License League.

Reaction Against No-License in the South.

Disuse of Strong Drink not Promoted by Prohibition.

Medical Estimate of Malt Products.

Louisville Journal Review of the Situation.

England Legalizes the Saloon.

Revolt of Maine Against Prohibition.

Prohibition Failure Confessed by Its Chief Organ.

SUNDAY SCHOOL PICTURES. 113. A. ALLORI. 1544-1628.
W. A. WILDE CO.

CHRIST IN HOUSE OF MARY AND MARTHA.

INTRODUCTORY.

Bible Counsels on Women, Wine, and Strong Drink.

Under date of October 13, 1908, the "Twentieth Century Pledge Signing Crusade," addressing the present writer as "Dear Fellow Worker," made this statement:

"There is in all parts of our Country today an awakening interest in the question of the sale and use of alcoholic drinks. Daily papers and magazines are giving more space than ever to the discussion of this important question. The spirit of reform is in the air, and there is everywhere a determination among good people to rid the land of this terrible curse of intemperance.

The Liquor Traffic is alarmed and thoroughly aroused. It apparently has unlimited energy and capital. Its Agents are utterly unscrupulous in their methods, and are constantly making assertions as to the benefits arising from the use of alcoholic beverages that have no basis in fact; and they do not hesitate to quote the names of illustrious men like Wesley and Lincoln in defense of their nefarious business.

Today the Liquor Traffic is in the ascendancy. Under our present Interstate Commerce Law there is not a town, city or State in the Union that can by its vote prevent the shipment of alcoholic beverages into its borders.

We desire to call your special attention to the facts stated on the enclosed card:—The steadily increasing per capita consumption of strong drinks; a national drink bill of $2,275,070,857. The alarming increase of drunkenness in our state—the record of arrests in 1907 being 86,140 men and women, and the unprecedented wave of serious crimes.

The battle is on! The people are aroused! The temperance forces have right and justice on their side. Economics, Science, Morality and History have joined hands against the drink evil.

I write you as a friend of the temperance cause, and bespeak your hearty co-operation in the work of reform."

To the author of this volume the battle has been on since, in 1867, as minister for seven years of the First Parish in Medford, he participated in the great overthrow of state prohibition in Massachusetts by a sermon on "Temperance Without Prohibition."

The growth of production and use of drinks that are more or

less alcoholic is unquestionably significant. In the record of the men of the Mayflower it is related that among the distresses of the planting of Plymouth was the failure of their English ale, compelling dependence for drink upon the water of their hillside springs. The present situation is indeed a change, and its magnitude more than suggests that good reasons have played a very large part in it.

Is the Liquor Traffic in the ascendancy by fraud, or by response to public demand? To say, as the above statement does, that with unlimited money its agents are utterly unscrupulous in their methods, and are falsifiers in their claims of benefit, means either extreme indifference to indisputable facts or extreme mendacity.

However it may be with the names of Wesley and Lincoln, the names of Christ, of Paul, of George Washington, of the late Bishop Potter, and of a great array of sages, scholars, statesmen like Mr. Gladstone, can be used without contradiction against prohibition of the sale and use of alcoholic drinks. If disregard of justice, truth, and decency in utterance, is in question, prohibition fanaticism is absolutely unexampled. The speeches made by the zealots of prohibition recall the scripture which says:

"Bread of falsehood is sweet to a man;
But afterwards his mouth shall be filled with gravel."

The terrible double curse of the drink situation, which drives many men and more women into hysterics of misrepresentation, misconception, and mendacity, cannot be removed save by surgery not less true than thorough. On the one hand excess in the use of drink, and on the other hand enormity in saloon supply of detrimental cups, reach a breadth of private and public injury which are the scandal and horror of our civilization, second only to the shame and woe of womanhood submerged in immorality. But prohibition can no more demand disuse of wine than it can separate man from woman. Scripture instructs us that,

"He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle,
And herb for the service of man;
That He may bring forth bread out of the earth,
And wine that maketh glad the heart of man:
Oil to make his face to shine,
And bread that strengtheneth man's heart."*

Of "the strange woman," who seems to have been at her worst among the Jews, good counsel says:

---

*Psalm 104; 14, 15.

"Let not thine heart decline to her ways,
Go not astray in her paths.
For she hath cast down many wounded:
Yea, all her slain are a mighty host.
Her house is the way to Sheol,
Going down to the chambers of death."*

And most true is the advice to beware of excess in wine and strong drink:

"Wine is a mocker, strong drink a brawler,
And whosoever reeleth thereby is not wise."**

"Who hath 'Oh!' Who hath 'Alas!'?
Who hath darkness of eyes?
They that tarry long at the wine,...
When it giveth its color in the cup,
When it goeth down smoothly.
At the last it biteth like a serpent,
And stingeth like a Basilisk."***

But in the same chapter of counsel we read of food no less than drink as a peril to the man of appetite:

"When thou sittest to eat with a ruler,
Consider diligently what is before thee,
For thou wilt put a knife to thy throat
If thou be a man given to appetite.
Be not desirous of his dainties,
Seeing they are deceitful meat."****

And above these counsels we continually read the sad warning to beware of "the strange woman—who is a deep ditch, a narrow pit—Yea she lieth in wait as for a prey, And increaseth the treacherous among men." It was a story so dark as to cause the writer of counsels to say "A virtuous woman who can find?" and yet to say "Many daughters have done virtuously.*****

The balance of just discrimination and wise counsel appears in the oracle of King Lemuel "which his mother taught him":

"Give not thy strength unto women,
Nor thy ways unto them that destroy kings.
It is not for kings, O Lemuel, it is not for kings to drink wine,
Nor for princes to desire strong drink,
Lest they drink and forget that which is decreed,
And pervert the judgment of the sons of affliction.

---

*Proverbs 7; 25-27. **Prov. 20; 1. ***Proverbs 23; 29-32. ****Proverbs 23; 1, 2, 27, 28. *****Proverbs 31; 10, 29.

Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish,
And wine unto the bitter in soul:
Let him drink, and forget his poverty,
And remember his misery no more.
Open thy mouth for the dumb,
In the cause of all such as are left desolate.
Open thy mouth, judge righteously,
And minister judgment to the poor and needy."*

The story of human shame and sorrow is told here in the order of its darkest aspects, sins that are with dishonor to woman, yet without the slightest question of her supreme place in healthy and happy life; disastrous errors in the use of a chief bounty of nature, yet with express commandment of liberal use in relief of poverty and misery (not only wine but strong drink); and the injunction of justice and mercy to pronounce judgment of compassion and charity for all the dumb wretchedness, poverty, and need which seek, even if they do not find, solace in the houses of temptation which we know as saloons.

True Origin of Saloon Evils.

It will be seen in the follow pages how exactly this represents the contention of ex-Gov. John A. Andrew, that poverty, misery, social distress, are a chief cause of resort to the saloon, and not as commonly assumed, the fruit of such resort; and that the better state of things must come, not through prohibition closing all saloons, but through comprehensive and thorough charity dealing effectively with poverty, misery, and social distress.

Massachusetts has never had a citizen more conspicuous for high intelligence, pure conscience, and large humanity, than her great war governor, whose plea against state prohibition, in 1867, remains a monumental support to the great cause of temperance without prohibition. He found, as we still find, a problem of extreme magnitude, and the greatest difficulty, in the question made so painful by the terrible mass of evils which are connected with the production and supply to the public of stimulant drinks.

Gov. Andrew, representing an immense weight of the best citizenship of the state, made a plea of great breadth and power against prohibition, and in favor of "a judicious license law"; and in particular he took the ground that the terrible evils, which pro-

*Proverbs 31; 3 9.

voke so many to excess of prohibition fanaticism, are due, not to the saloons, where we commonly see them, but to distresses farther back, the hopeless pressure of which saloons show some sort of escape from.

It was an unquestionably just contention that men are driven to the saloons by conditions which could be in very large part removed, if justice, kindness, and confidence, were thoroughly manifested in social, religious, and industrial quarters. A survey of all the facts, reasonings, and appeals bearing upon the problem, justifies insistence in the strongest terms, that prohibition, whether by state law, as in Maine and eight other states, or by local option, as in Cambridge, Worcester, Lynn, and a large number of towns, is not only a grievous violation of human rights, but a scandalous disregard of good counsel, of Christian principle and method.

The scheme of the late Bishop Potter, proposing saloons on lines of temperate use of stimulant drinks, was more than a suggestion in the right direction, only needing to be enlarged upon through church and charity action, and put into operation on the broad basis of an ideal saloon law.

Two supreme aims are presented: (1) To control, check, or cure as much as possible, whatever use of intoxicants, or of any stimulating drinks, is found to be detrimental in any way, either to the drinker, to his domestic interests, or to society; and (2) To control, check, or cure as much as possible, whatever sale of intoxicants, or of any stimulating drinks, is found to be detrimental in any way, either to the drinker, to his domestic interests, or to society.

It most especially falls to the churches, and to comfortable and cultivated society generally to prosecute the first of these aims, and therewith also to meet other demands upon them of human need, such as provision for the domestic comfort of those under pressure of distress during the season of cold; and, even more than this, the use of means to safeguard the health of children who go illy clad and half fed to the public schools, and supply so great a number of victims of epidemic disease.

Social and Church Failure.

The supreme failure is that of churches which are in great part synagogues of superstition and selfishness, dominated by extreme ignorance of the Teaching of Christ, whose Gospel was one of justice, mercy, and good will, social justice, devotion to our fellows in the relations of life, work for man rather than any formal-

ities of worship and observance. It was reputed with the Hebrew sages of deepest and broadest view that all truth of Old Scripture was summed up in the ideal of doing justly, loving mercy (or kindness to our fellows), and walking humbly in the conduct of life.

It was this ideal upon which Jesus of Nazareth rose, as a Teacher and Reformer, to pronounce that Golden Rule of Human Brotherhood which still awaits comprehensive acceptance by nominally Christian mankind.

Thomas Jefferson wrote, July 9, 1820: "I trust that the genuine and simple religion of Jesus will one day be restored, such as it was preached and practiced by himself. Very soon after his death, it became muffled up in mysteries, and has ever since been kept in concealment from the vulgar eye."

For more than a century it has become increasingly plain that two Christianities are preparing to contend for recognition in the future religious history of the world,—the one that which Christ himself founded, and which new knowledge in science supports, and the other that of which a Yale divinity professor has recently said: "Christianity as we know it is Pauline Christianity," and against which science and scholarship, and common human feeling and thought, are increasingly arrayed.

The sanity of Channing, which carried his fame all over Europe, was in his Humanism, broadly but simply based on the Golden Rule of Christ,—a religion of justice, kindness, and confidence from man to man, irrespective of theology, of pietism and spiritism,—a religion of the life of man and of this world, such as the Presbyterian, Dr. John Watson (Ian Maclaren, of "Bonnie Briar Bush" fame) refers to when he says:

"When Jesus gave his doctrine of Love in its final form, one is struck by a startling omission: he laid on his desciples the repeated charge of Love to one another, he did not once command them to love God. While his preachers have in the main exhorted men to love God, Jesus in the main exhorted them to love their fellow men."

And Dr. Watson hints at the cause of this contrast in the fact that the cue of the preachers has been taken from, not Christ but Paul, of whom Dr. Watson says: "Is not his doctrine often rabbinical, rather than Christian?"

Almost all institutional authority is so entangled with the universally accredited Pauline Christianity as to make it exceedingly difficult getting a hearing even for the other type. The "International Congress of Religious Liberals," recently held with great success in Boston, marked a genial readiness of "a good few," as

the Yorkshire phrase is, to come together in public conference. But as yet, no liberalism has done anything for comprehensive and adequate reformation of religion, not merely in respect of its temper, but in respect of the grave errors and grievious malpractices surviving under all forms of communion.

The most remarkable of the utterances of the celebrated Dr. Channing sounded a note of new departure thought which is as much disregarded at Harvard and Berlin today as in the days when there was no religious liberalism. Channing said:

"The false theology which has buried us for ages is burying us still in night. The corruptions which we are trying to expose in the popular systems are, perhaps, superficial compared with those which remain unrecognized and which we all inherit. The true Reformation, I apprehend, is yet to come. None of us hold Christianity in its purity."

Instruction at Harvard, and Unitarian preaching generally, are following such German scholars as Harnack and Pfleiderer in profoundly mistaken adherence still to a Christianity of ""Apostles," notably Paul,—a Jewish Christianity, the central feature of which was Jewish Theism, whereas the Christianity of Christ was essentially Humanism. The error of thus taking Paul as the Christian guide, and Paul's view of Jesus as a more than human "Messiah," could not well be more plain.

When strictly orthodox scholars admit, as Dr. Bacon already quoted says, that "Christianity as we know it is Pauline Christianity," we may surely assume that what Paul substituted for the Christianity of Christ himself, a "Messianic" system based on rabbinical Jewish ideas, must be "the false theology burying us still in night" of which Dr. Channing spoke.

The moral, social, human disaster of the situation created by theology, as "Christians" have it from Paul, is in its making false Christians. Jewish theology was a fraud of priestcraft in representing that faith in Jehovah secured divine favor in spite of no matter what sins, and the Jew could give his life to pursuit of gain, honest or dishonest, humane or cruel, if he kept faith with Jehovah, or in other words paid in his shekels at the Temple in Jerusalem. In extreme contrast to this Christ demanded justice to be done to all, kindness to all under all circumstances, and universal good will from man to man on humane grounds irrespective of religious, social, or other distinctions, such as Jewish religion made of extreme importance.

Christ taught that work for man is everything, that worship

does not matter; that not prayers, anthems, Bible readings, expositions, and beliefs, but deeds of justice, kindness, confidence, in common human relationships, count for true religion. But churches of every name ignore the teaching, spirit, method, and example of Christ, and take their cue from the Jewish ideas, and example of Paul. Even the most liberal carry this preference of Paul, and indifference to Christ, to excess. That Boston Unitarianism, at Harvard and far out in the country at large, should hark back to Pauline theology, spiritism, and pietism, shows decadence of the most surprising sort, while New England orthodoxy generally offers no promise but of the same disastrous facing backwards into the traditions of spiritist-theism.

Of the Unitarian situation it is needless to speak except for profound regret that developments, intellectual, ethical, humane, and social, unmatched in the history of human culture,—manhood and womanhood unsurpassed in any age or race—have deplorably failed in respect of leading the world forward, or even of looking in the only forward direction—that of the Christianity of Christ in contrast with the false Christism or Messianic Judaism of Paul, whose pseudo-apostleship and pseudo-gospel brought back the night of false theology and delusive worship from which Jesus in his Teaching sought to free human life and human conduct.

Dr. John Watson on the True Christian Method.

Dr. John Watson (Ian Maclaren), quoted above, a representative of Presbyterianism looking forward, says in one of his "Mind of the Master" sermons:

"How can one conquer sin? How can one come to perfection? How can one have fellowship with God? How can one save the world? And to a hundred questions of this kind Jesus has one answer: 'Love the man next you'." (p. 161).

"Jesus was the only thinker who grasped the whole situation root and branch. He did not propose to make sin illegal: that had been done without conspicuous benefit. He proposed to make sin impossible by replacing it with love. Love is the destruction of sin, the death of all bitter and unholy moods of the soul, because love lifts the man out of himself and teaches him to live in another. The individualism of selfishness is the disintegrating force which has cursed this world. The altruism of love is the consolidating force which will save the world, reconciling every man to his fellows and re-creating society." (pp. 162, 163.)

"Conventional religion divides love into provinces—natural

love, ranging from the interest of a philanthropist in the poor to the passion of a mother for her child, and spiritual love, whose humblest form is the fellowship of the Christian Church and whose highest is the devotion of the soul to God. This artifice is the outcome of a limited vision; it has been published by a contracted heart. It has ended in the disparagement of natural love and the unreality of spiritual love. Jesus never once sanctioned this mischievous distinction: He bitterly satirizes its effect on conduct. The Pharisee offers to God the gift which ought to have gone to his parents' support—so devoted was he to God, so lifted above ordinary affection! Life is the school of love, in which we rise from love of mother and wife and child through a long discipline of sacrifice to the love of God." (pp. 164, 165.)

"Perhaps the most brilliant inspiration of Jesus was to fling himself on the earliest, latest, strongest passion of our nature, and utilize it as the driving force of his religion. All our life from infancy to age we are in the school of love, and never does human nature so completely shed the slough of selfishness, or wear so generous a guise, or offer such ungruding service, as when under this sway. Do you wish a cause to endure hardness, to rejoice in sacrifice, to accomplish mighty works, to retain forever the dew of its youth: give it the best chance, the sanction of love." (pp. 185, 186.)

Dr. Watson more than intimates that Jesus, as a Teacher of social justice through fidelity to the law of love, entirely set aside the claim of the Scriptures of Judaism to authority. Thus he says:

"'Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time,' opens one paragraph after another of Jesus' great Sermon, and then follows, 'But I say unto you.' Jesus brushes aside the ancients as if they had never been." (pp. 183,184.)

"The Sermon on the Mount has been until lately very much shelved by theologians, but it remains the manifesto of Jesus' religion. Jesus was an absolute and unreserved believer in character. Nothing could be easier than to say 'Lord, Lord,' but that did not count. Jesus only has founded on character; has dared to believe that character, the beatitudes in action, will be irresistible. The aggression of Jesus is the propagation of character. The victory of Jesus is to be the victory of character. When Jesus grounds his religion on character he gives a radiant proof of his sanity and wins at once the suffrages of reasonable men. There is nothing on which we differ so hopelessly as creed, nothing on which we agree so utterly as character. According to the consistent teaching of Jesus a christian is one of the same likeness as Himself, and nothing

will more certainly debauch the religious sense than any shifting of labels, so that one who keeps Jesus' commandments is denied his name, and one in whom there is no resemblance to Jesus receives it on grounds of correct opinion. One cannot imagine our Master requiring the world to accept a disciple on the ground of the man's declaration of faith; He would offer to the world the test of the man's life. With his appreciation of character Jesus affords us a ground of certitude which can be found nowhere else in religion. This is where Christian ethics have an enormous advantage over Christian theology. There can be no finality in theology. It must ever be an uncertain ground of judgment. But there can be no place within the moral order where the man of the Beatitudes will not be judged perfect. At no time and in no circumstances can he be condemned or depreciated. One cannot yield to the force of Jesus' teaching without asking, Will the final Assize be held on faith or on character? As a matter of fact, the best public mind under all religions has judged by character, and has done so with a keen sense of justice and a conviction of paramount authority. It is a working principle of life that judgment goes by character, and if in the end it goes by faith, it would cover our moral sense with confusion and add another to the unintentional wrongs men have endured, in this world, at their fellows' hands. It were useless to argue about a matter of which we know nothing. It is an unspeakable relief to find our Master crowning his teaching on character with the scene of the Last Judgment. When the parable form is reduced and accidental details laid aside, it remains that the Book of Judgment is the Sermon on the Mount." (pp. 54-63.)

"The Sermon on the Mount was Christ's manifesto, and the constitution of Christianity. Among all the creeds of Christendom the only one which has the authority of Christ himself is the Sermon on the Mount. When one reads this Creed given by Jesus, and the Creeds which have been made by Christians, he cannot fail to detect an immense difference, and it does not matter whether he selects the Nicene Creed or the Westminster Confession. They all have a family likeness to each other, and a family unlikeness to the Sermon on the Mount. They deal with different subjects, they move in a different atmosphere. Were the Athanasian Creed and the Beatitudes printed in parallel columns, one would find it hard to believe that both documents were virtually intended to serve the same end, to be a basis of discipleship. It is not that they vary in details, insisting on different points of one consistent covenant, but that they are constructed on different principles. When one

asks, "What is a Christian?" the Creeds and the Sermon not only do not give the same answer, but models so contradictory that from the successive specifications he could create two types without any apparent resemblance.

"What must strike every person about Jesus' sermon is that it is not metaphysical but ethical. When one turns to the Creeds the situation has changed. They have nothing to do with character. From their first word to the last they are physical or metaphysical, not ethical. They dwell on the relation of the three Persons in the Holy Trinity; the Divine and human natures in the Person of Jesus; His miraculous birth through the power of the Holy Ghost; the connection between his sacrifice and the Divine law.

"No church since the early centuries has had the courage to formulate an ethical creed, for even those bodies of Christians which have no written theological creeds, yet have implicit affirmations or denials of doctrine as their basis. Imagine a body of Christians who should take their stand on the sermon of Jesus, and conceive their creed on his lines. Does one say that no church could stand and work on such a basis? For three too short years the Church of Christ had none else, and it was by holy living, and not by any metaphysical subtleties, the Primitive Church lived, and suffered, and conquered." (pp. 15-22.)

The origin of disastrous departure from the simple practical teaching of Jesus, an ethical basis not a theological, is suggested in some references to what has come to us in the name of "Apostles," and notably from Paul and those who wrote as disciples of Paul. Thus Dr. Watson says: "It were amazing if either prophets or apostles should supplement Jesus. When any person imagines revelation in Holy Scripture as a level plain wherein Abraham or Paul stands as high as Jesus, he gives one pause: when any person conceives of revelation as an ascending scale, wherein the apostles stand above Jesus, he astounds one. When any one writes as if Paul were in the affair of teaching not only the equal of Jesus but his superior—giving to the world more precious truth than Christ—he has surely somewhat failed in reverence for the Master. It must strike any one comparing the words of Jesus with the writings of Paul that the Apostle is less than his Master. One shrinks from suggesting that the Apostle as a teacher is less than the greatest, but one may not make him equal to Jesus. Is not his style at times overwrought by feeling? Are not some of his illustrations forced? Is not his doctrine often rabbinical rather than Christian? The Evangel of Jesus is never local, never narrow, never unintelligible;

it is ever calm, convincing, human. It is a grave question whether, indeed, Paul claimed to be on the same level of authority as Jesus. Could one imagine Paul declaring that he had added to the teaching of Jesus, and that without his Epistles the Gospels would have had little value." (pp. 30-39.)

Of "the eleven apostles," Dr. Watson says: "It is superfluous to inquire whether they understood Jesus' Evangel,—those honest, dense children of Judaism interrupting with their hopeless questions. Did Jesus suppose that they were entering into His mind or could expound his words? He was under no fond delusion. Why did He charge such men to be his preachers? We have not yet seen the last period of the history of the Church and must remind ourselves at every turn: that the Church has not yet compassed the mind of the Master. The mind of Jesus seems nothing more as yet than a grey dawn; but wise men can see it is the rising sun." (pp. 39-41, 179.)

Dr. Watson's thoughts of this advanced type, pregnant as they are with suggestions of new departure, looking forward and not backward, thoroughly and decisively ruling theology out of the account and making the life of goodness from man to man take the place of faith, whether faith in God, or in him as Messiah after Paul's idea, or in immortality,—these comprehensive, profoundly significant thoughts, wide as their sweep is and destructive of creed and church as they are, do not anything like cover the whole ground of new learning engaged to recover the genuine Christianity of Christ, in contrast with the Jewish Christism of Paul.

In one of his earlier sermons Dr. Watson had said: "It was like Jesus that he does not offer any proof of Heaven, and for the same reason that our Master does not affirm the existence of God."

There cannot be the least question that worship of the God for which the Jewish Temple stood was to the Teaching of Jesus of no account, and that work for man took the place to him of worship, devotion in human relations being made the only true devotion. Had not Paul intervened for origins dating from him, twenty to forty years after the death of Jesus, there would have been in Christianity no requirement of "faith." Dr. Watson weakens in his grasp of the facts when he says that "certain truths of the first order Jesus was unable to give to his disciples, because they would have been before the event and therefore unintelligible at the time; that "their statement had: to be left to the apostles, and without Paul we had not possessed a complete gospel;" and that "if there be two truths of this kind, surely they are the sacrifice of Jesus and

the presence of the Holy Ghost." But these "two truths" were of the substance of the rabbinical Jewish "theology" which Christ most certainly set aside as not in any sense of the essentials of religion. "Mercy and not sacrifice,"—and mercy in the sense of kindness from man to man was repeatedly insisted on by Christ, as it had in fact been by all the best teachings before him.

An imperative of knowledge which is absolutely beyond dispute, calls upon churches of every name to make religion a matter of our relations one with another in the present life, on the basis of the Golden Rule of human brotherhood which Christ made fundamental. The substitute for this which Paul introduced was a disaster through which the Christianity of history was fearfully corrupted, and that disaster is notably conspicuous and operative in the neglect of churches of every name to give work for man the first place, even if worship gives way altogether. In the plainest possible manner Christ taught that praying much and often was heathenish, that men should take God for granted, that we no more need invoke divine goodness than we need to offer sun-worship. But Paul, a terribly Jew-Pharisee, knew nothing of this, and his Gospel of faith and beliefs, of worship and prayer, rules out Christ's Gospel of social justice, kindness, and confidence.

Better the entire suspense of worship, and disuse of prayer, Bible study, and sentimental song, than the present selfishness of superstition professing piety while utterly failing to adequately prosecute work of justice mercy and good will.

The Cambridge, Lynn and Worcester Situation.

The wrong of separatism for cities of the rank and character of Cambridge, Lynn, and Worcester, cannot be justified under any principles in the least fair and right. Cambridge, for instance, gets the form of no-license, not only as the merest Hypocrisy, the form without the fact, but with fact of drink evils made greatly worse than they would be under home license. Close to Boston, Cambridge drinkers make Boston saloons their constant resort, with a double increase of detriment, from time and money spent to go and come, and from indulgence in evil cups beyond what a near-by home saloon would tempt them to.

Cambridge, moreover, as a community specially capable of good counsel and effective administration, turns her back on a supreme responsibility, that of doing everything possible to have the best class of saloons under proper license; and lets a great mass of her citizens go astray in Boston schools of dissipation. It may be

doubted whether a worse case of criminal failure of a community to provide within its own borders for its own people can be anywhere found than that of Harvard Square Cambridge, piously watching out against open entertainment attractions for Harvard students, while for every possible indulgence the saloon, hotel and theatre gates of hell in Boston are wide open, with neither advisers nor watchers to warn and guide. A Social Hall at Harvard, where a thousand men could have an evening cup for temperate refreshment, would be greatly preferable to the night revels so easily had in Boston.

The Harvard Cambridge owes it to popular culture, in the direction of reform, to make large experiment of the saloon ideal of Bishop Potter. It is one of many notable scandals that the Harvard Pharisee goes to church just enough to keep the Almighty posted on his standing, "not as other men are," and lets publicans and sinners take their chance of paradise or perdition on the Boston side of the Charles river. It is, moreover, a disaster most deplorable that so large a community, with pretensions so considerable and possibilities so unquestioned, should lack the nerve and energy to broadly establish city conditions, and have done with those of a cloister which are absurdly out of relation to the student body of today, which is no longer that of a divinity factory, to prepare pious youth for pulpit and prayer meeting service. An acre or two of thoroughly ideal hotel, on the convenient graveyard between two of the ancient churches, with large provision for student entertainment, would be to great advantage every way. Ignorance, not to say insanity, maintaining such a shrine of doubtful scrimmage as the Stadium, the physiologies of which are all wrong, would much better have taken the chances of half a million in a Social Hall, or a big College Hotel on the Bishop Potter Tavern plan. Deplorable to the last degree it is that some rich philanthropist like Pierpont Morgan should not have long since taken in hand to make Cambridge less like a village and more like a city.

Forty years ago Harvard led in the great uprising of the state against commonwealth prohibition, Harvard professors and the best Boston pulpits. A return to the demand then made for "judicious license," with co-operation suggested by the failures of the intervening period, would be of continental effect for reform far exceeding in significance everything yet accomplished.

It may be of small account to Boston to provide for Cambridge visitation, but for Chelsea to suffer the irruption of hordes of Lynn drinkers is a calamity which the law, to be at all "judicious," ought

not to allow. A municipality so heavily burdened as Lynn with needs and duties growing out of the drink interest ought not to be permitted to make experiment of the No-License Hypocrisy which betters nothing whatever, but in every respect aggrivates the real evils which call for reform. It is a rascal trick for Lynn to push these evils over the border into Chelsea, or into the secret places of poison dispensation by bad liquors within her own limits. The wrong, not to say outrage, upon the honest and just rights of an immense labor interest, in such an industrial centre as Lynn, would alone justify making it impossible for a bigoted, intolerant, fanatical majority, to deprive the toiling class of a ministry to their needs which ranks in importance second to no other. The fact is that local option is the more unjust, criminal, and detestable form of prohibition, and idiotic as well as rascal to be voted up, or voted down, upon the chance of a bare majority in a scratch local election, such as that at Worcester, last December, most conspicuously and most certainly was. And in respect of the labor interest the action of the American Federation of Labor, in the convention at Lowell, Mass., October 12th, was in the direction of genuine and just reform. The press report said:

"A. F. of L. Declares Against Prohibition: Says It is Demoralizing and Would also Throw Many Men out of Employment.

It unanimously voted opposition to the 'drastic measures proposed by the advocates of prohibition' and favored the supervision and control, by officials, of saloons and all places where liquor is sold and dispensed.

The convention demanded 'complete recognition of the just demand of labor working at the different crafts employed in the manufacture and sale of malt and spirituous liquors.'

It was argued that the success of the prohibition movement would cause hundreds of thousands of trade unionists to be thrown out of employment and thereby 'add to the poverty and misery now prevailing among the working people.'

The convention believed, it is said, in the American principle of the broadest personal liberty of the individual in so far as the exercise of that liberty is in keeping with law and order and good government.

Statistics compiled by the government were referred to as showing that prohibition breeds 'dives' and 'joints,' where traffic in liquor is carried on in violation of law, resulting not only in the government being deprived of revenue to which it is justly entitled, but also creating a contempt for all laws.

'We believe in temperance, not only in the use of liquors, but temperance in all things, including the advocacy of measures under the name of reform,' the convention proclaimed in the resolution on this question."

The Worcester slump of the Heart of the Commonwealth to No-License is a comprehensive illustration of the most absurdly rascal action under existing state law. In every aspect of the change to No-License the situation is one for derision and detestation. It alone should challenge the Legislature to thorough reconsideration of the problems involved, the crimes which have been committed, the wrongs needing remedy.

A municipality commits a crime against a very great number of its citizens in not only cutting off their supply of comforts, necessities, and luxuries, by reckless and ruinous prohibition, but in making it criminal, subject to outrageous police inquisition and iniquitous court penalty, to make efforts against the law. Even if bad results of free use and free trade in ale, beer, cider, wines, whiskey, and brandy, were tenfold what the zealots of prohibition assert, the injustice, outrage upon undeniable rights, and inhumanity of an adimnistration such as Worcester has had for the last six months, is a scandalous blot upon not only our civilization but our Christianity. The fanatics of intemperate, unprincipled, unscrupulous legalism care no more for the Golden Rule of Christ than the Spanish Inquisition did; they proceed on the exact method, and in the identical spirit of the "Scribes, Pharisees, and Hypocrites," who hounded Jesus of Nazareth to his death, or, in our own time, of the murderers of saintly women alleged to come under the Bible law, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Instead of seeking to do justice, loving to show mercy, and humbling themselves before God, they pretend Divine authority, fiercely disregard human need, and make themselves executioners of a wickedly false "justice"—a form of justice without the fact. They are what Christ meant by Hypocrites (not in our modern sense of the term), zealots of formalism, of observance of form and ordinance, regardless of justice, love, and concord within the form. They are what Christ meant by Pharisees, pretenders to piety "not as other men," and what he meant by Scribes, Bible men, armed with texts of very select import, regardless of a larger view, and heedless of reason, of humanity, of doing as they would be done by. Such men as Mayor Logan, Professor Chamberlain, and Dr. Tomlinson, are, by much excellence of character, of the very type which has made inquisition even to blood, and persecution even to hideous torture and cruel death, a principal

feature of Christian communion during ages of grievous misconception and gross maladministration. It was of the very essence of Judaic Hypocrisy in Mayor Logan to put his back against a temporary and trumpery ordinance, voted, as to its majority, by the Democratic license wards, and proclaim himself stone deaf to motives of civic duty and human brotherhood which are permanent factors of ideal law and order. With some breadth of intelligence, some sincerity and depth of human sympathy, and some strength of conscience, a mayor should not be, and could not be, slavishly observant of a vote of the moment of no fundamental validity. The case, except on the Jew lines of the murder of Jesus, and the Puritan lines of the witchcraft murder, was one for strict observance of motives of higher law, in no matter what restraint upon the "fool-fury" of prohibition fanatics. The Jews thought it answered to say "We know that God spake unto Moses;" the Puritan ministers and judges were of like mood, through bereft of reason and deaf to all sense of right; and not a whit better in judgment and justice are the Scribes, Pharisees, and Hypocrites of conscienceless intolerance, degrading law and order to shameless denial of rights and privileges against the enjoyment of which there can be no reasonable complaint. The restraint by municipal ordinance upon families, in the matter of ordering domestic supplies, has no more warrant as applying to drinks, like cider, ale, beer, than it would have applied to tea, coffee, and grape juice. It is, moreover, a most unrighteous and impolitic blow at local business, so many families will transfer their entire orders to Boston where for a part they are forced to do this. Cambridge is particularly handicapped to the advantage of Boston by its senseless restraint upon trade under no-license. There could hardly be a madness more extreme than that of desire to repress by intolerant proscription the use, or even the abuse, of liquors; and to expect success of any real value for such proscription requires lunatic ignorance and credulity. It is but too easy to let the evils of excess in drink, and the crime of saloon-catering to that excess, rouse in the best of men a passion of intolerant repression, under the fervor of which a just view of the facts, and a just sense of duty, are greatly disturbed, even if not wholly overthrown. The address of Rev. Bernard S. Conaty, as president of the Springfield Catholic Total Abstinence Society, at its meeting in Worcester, October 15, 1908, was notably inaccurate in this statement of recent facts:

"As I now survey the whole field of action, I behold signal victories won, notably here in this very city of Worcester. Thanks to

the energy, good will, co-operation and persistent endeavor of the united Total Abstinence Societies here in the heart of the commonwealth, forces that had lain dormant were galvanized into life. There has swept over the country a mighty wave of temperance reform. Every section of our country has felt its potent influence. Volcano-like it has shaken the very foundations of the social fabric in certain localities. The liquor element has publicly acknowledged that it reads therein a mysterious handwriting upon the wall, a most forceful protest against the saloon evil. Indeed there has gone forth an edict from certain wine and liquor dealers that a new era has dawned, a golden age of righteousness.

"The old-time conquerer of haughty mien and of unprincipled ways has lost his kingdom and his crown and is now humbly suing for peace. There must be now the model saloon, the saloon without the obscene statues and pictures luring to vice. The saloon where the drunkard will be refused entrance, the saloon to which all classes may go as to a highly respectable cafe. Surely we have fallen upon brighter days. I am an optimist of optimists. I believe the world is daily growing better. Industrial and social conditions are vastly improved, thanks to the awakened conscience of an intelligent people and the fearless voicing of the people's demand for the better control of all elements contributing to our social welfare.

"We cannot be silent admirers of all these eventful happenings. 'Be just and fear not.' 'Act well your part, there all the honor lies'."

The result in Worcester last December was not in the least due to any galvanizing of forces that had lain dormant. Peculiar local circumstances, destructive of harmony of action among Democratic supporters of license, caused certain license wards to vote no-license, as, under the circumstances, favorable to their interest in liquor, as against the interest of the existing licensed saloons; and the real doubt today about the future is whether there is not more money in illicit than in licensed trade. The hope of the future is that a large contingent of judicious friends of temperance will see the criminal folly of lining up with the groggery reprobates to promote repression of licensed to the advantage of illicit trade. It is a wave of prohibition passion, not a real temperance reform, which has swept over the country, and reaction from this is already a chief portent of the times.

The good Catholic Father is greatly mistaken in his conception of "the liquor element," and his characterization of the present saloon situation. Under the Massachusetts law at least even various attractions of innocent character are not permitted, and no fact is

more incontestable than the thoroughly intelligent and honest desire of the trade to see every saloon become "a highly respectable cafe." The model license efforts conspicuously active are no new result of alarm at the progress of reform. There are no such results in the wild swing of the pendulum of passion, and the brewers, distillers, and allied trades, are intervening, upon knowledge and motives which are not new to them, to accomplish results of real and lasting benefit where prohibition has deplorably failed.

Father Conaty justly observes that we have fallen upon better days, that conditions are vastly improved, and that "the highly respectable cafe" is the ideal of the liquor interest. An example of this in Boston, in a street of specially saloon character in the past, has recently come under the present writer's notice in the large establishment, at 33-37 Eliot street, of the Jacob Wirth Company, where an ordinary saloon, with tables for more than 200 guests, has become as reputable a place of service of the best quality of moderately expensive food as any temperance restaurant could be, yet with equal service of beer, ale, and light wines. The Company have long been importers of Rhine wines, from their own vineyards in Europe, and their trade as carefully and faithfully discriminates against every possible aspect of saloon excess or impropriety as any Bishop Potter ideal tavern could do. The developments given this fine result have come with the high German intelligence and notable character, which are so large a factor in the best progress of American culture. And they mark a wide trend of wholesome, righteous saloon development, which might become universal if churches and social order would do their bounden duty towards the vast toiling class whose needs require such a ministry as that of the Wirth saloon.

Father Conaty's position as a representative of Catholic judgment and charity, in the meeting of the Total Abstinence Union of which he is the head, admirably illustrates the judgment of wisdom in the matter of stimulant drinks. The more total abstinence where it is needed the better, although Catholic repression of the natural development of womanhood would undoubtedly give way to a generous use of the bounties of nature if light on the path of Christian life were what it should be. The press report of the course taken by Father Conaty presented several points of interest. It was as follows:

"Total Abstinence Union is not in No-License Column: Organization Refuses to Commit Itself to Active Participation in Campaign and Turns Down Motion of Springfield Delegate.

The Springfield Catholic Total Abstinence Union, representing a membership of 8500 members, did not commit itself to active participation in the no-license campaign at any time or in any part of the diocese, the effort of George W. Curtis of the Cathedral Society of Springfield again failing of fruition, at the closing session of the thirty-second annual convention of that body in Fr. Mathew Hall, yesterday afternoon.

Rev. Bernard S. Conaty declared that the motion seeking to have the union place itself on record as being in the no-license column, was out of order. Curtis said he would appeal from the decision of the chair to the National Association of Catholic Temperance Societies, but afterward experienced a change of mind on the subject and announced that he would abide by the ruling of President Conaty.

Curtis' third successive effort to have the union commit itself to the subject caused something of a sensation, he having stated that the resolutions committee had refused to entertain the proposition when he placed it before it with a view of having a report either favorable or unfavorable made upon it. This, he declared, was done under the express direction of Rev. Father Conaty, which allegation the rector of the Church of the Sacred Heart denied, stating that any motion of a political nature was quite out of order.

In his address of the forenoon Father Conaty said:—

'I need not remind you that our Diocesan Union has never allowed itself to become entangled in any political alliances. We are bound by our pledge to do all that we can to discountenance the drinking customs of society. That never was meant to our great National Union or to our Diocesan Union the campaigning for either a measure of license or no-license or of total prohibition. We are free men and our great directing bodies, such as this today, has never allowed, nor will they ever allow, the shackles to be placed on anyone.

'I will maintain from this chair this noble precedent and rule out of order any attempt of this nature, however well-meaning and conscientious the gentleman may be who fathers it.

'We are meeting for consultation. Foolish, indeed, would be those physicians who would recommend the same treatment to every sick person. There is no known panacea for all ills. Act in your given locality as your best judgment dictates. Our main work is the moral restraint practiced by the individual for the love of God and the salvation of the neighbor. We are a moral reform and preservation movement, blessed by the God and His church with

love toward all and malice toward none. To endeavor to turn from that lofty ideal is to thwart the purpose of our whole work.'

There was much interest felt throughout Worcester as to the outcome of the attempt that Curtis would make to have the union take a position against the granting of licenses to saloon-keepers in the diocese.

The matter had come up at the previous Worcester convention through the initiative of Curtis, and he then had the question put to a vote, it being defeated, 96 to 94. At Chicopee Falls, in 1906, the proposition was also defeated.

The Curtis measure transcended in importance about everything else that came before the convention during the afternoon, and after it was all over the delegates knelt in prayer as they had done when the session was opened by President Conaty."

The motion of Mr. Curtis, seconded by Thomas J. Costello, was in these words:

"I move that the Springfield Catholic Diocesan Total Abstinence Union place itself on record as being favorable to a no-license campaign being conducted by each society in the Union."

In response Father Conaty said:

"The motion is out of order. It bears upon a question which I feel it my duty as president of this Union should not be discussed in this convention."

"I appeal from the decision of the president," cried Curtis.

"I am acting as the president of the Springfield Diocesan Union," said Father Conaty. "I find that the constitution of the Union and also the constitution of the National Union does not provide for expressions along the line you have stated. My ruling is in accordance with that of the National body. I only carry out what I find in the constitution of our Diocesan convention. No-license may be very effectual here. It may be very ineffectual elsewhere. The argument is made that we have a pledge and by that pledge we are obliged to vote for no-license. I do not so interpret the meaning of total abstinence. We are part and parcel of a community in which sometimes we are called upon to choose between two evils, restrictive high license as against ineffectual no-license."

"Reverend president," said Curtis. "I have sense enough to abide by the decision of the chair."

There was vociferous applause, and when it had subsided it was voted to begin electing officers.

If under Protestant auspices there were like admirable control upon excess of ardor the temperance cause would not suffer wreck

as it now does in the recurring storms of political passion. The alternative, however, named by Father Conaty is not the last word of saloon reform. Low license, widely distributed to purveyors of domestic supplies, hotels, restaurants, and food and drink saloons; with security for permanent loss upon violation of restrictions against any form of detrimental sale, would unquestionably promote the wholly new order of things which already has examples, such as those named above.

Immense California Wine Interest.

Under the head of "Grape Growers and Prohibition," the Chicago Record-Herald, copied by the Boston Transcript, has reported as follows on the fight for life of an immense California wine interest against the murdering fanaticism of prohibition:

"Some time since there were reports of an organized movement among the hop growers of California against prohibition, and now the grape growers are forming associations in the various counties to keep up the fight. Like the hop growers, they denounce the evils of drunkenness and, like them also, they maintain that the liquor that is made from the produce of their fields is wholesome and desirable. On the business side this appeal is made to them by the president of the Grape Growers' Association of this State:

'When we will have educated the American people to the use of wines at their meals this State will be able to produce an income from the viticultural industry amounting to more than $200,000,000 per annum. This will bring millions of acres of idle land into production. It will give remunerative employment to millions of happy vineyardists, turn our mountains, now not even fit for sheep ranges, into luxuriant vineyards, make it possible to erect pretentious wineries, and even create new towns and cities throughout the United States.'

At one of the county conventions which was held recently resolutions were adopted recommending the use of pure wine among all families at home and urging upon the Legislature the passage of such laws as may be necessary in order that wine in California shall be 'permitted to be distributed freely to the people of the State, and this important product of the State shall not be affected by any prohibition law or regulation in any town, city or county in the State of California.

The wording of the resolution is interesting because it seems to call for a special exception of wine in case other liquors should be prohibited, and there is a suggestion of separation from the sa-

loon interests in the reference to the family use of liquor, but it is proposed to raise the campaign funds of the anti-Prohibitionists from all the connected trades and industries, the grape grower to pay an assessment of 25 cents an acre, the winemaker 5 cents on every ton of grapes crushed, and the dealers 50 cents on every $1,000 of goods handled.

Meanwhile the Prohibitionists are not idle. They are carrying on the work of organization in all parts of the State and maintaining a very active warfare."

There can be no question of the wisdom of these aims and the justice of these appeals, looking to popular appreciation throughout the country of the health and life, the medicinal and food value, of the California product; and this may include not only wines but brandies, the special medicinal value of which, for prevention of pneumonia, and other Poison Diseases, by its instant and thorough efficiency in checking the ill results of taking cold, ought to be better known than it is.

Medicine and physiology alike attest the cruel insanity, the diabolical wickedness, as well as the economic and industrial outrage, of any attempt whatever to prevent developments of such vast and beneficient promise as those of the vineyards of California. However ignorance, misconception, and false opinion, may persuade to doubt about our native wines, and to bigoted denunciation of their use, violent dictation by legal agency of their disuse has no more justification in reason and right that a like vegetarian appeal to legislation against the use of meat.

The rascal character of the cause stands shockingly revealed in the universal resort of the zealots of prohibition to assassination of public men, by unscrupulous mendacity, or by murdering passion, as regardless of justice, of kindness and good will, of brotherly love and Christian principle, as any savages of the wilderness could possibly be. "Lincoln," writing from Washington to the Boston Transcript, under date of October 17th, related as follows of the situation at the national capital:

"The District of Columbia is threatened with a prohibition law. The brewing and hotel interests are already alarmed. The prominence of the temperance issue in the pending presidential campaign is thus not without its direct relations to this capital. The fight now making on Speaker Cannon in his home district by the prohibition elements of the Republican party, because they resent his obstruction of the bill to prevent the nullification of local prohibition

through the privileges of interstate commerce, is ostensibly aimed at the general power of the speakership. They regard him as the last of the House tyrants. But if they should succeed in dethroning him, or in breaking the power of his office, and he or any succcessor should allow a straight prohibition bill to go to roll call—putting an end to the sale of liquors at all hotels and clubs in the District of Columbia—the chances are large that it would pass.

The anti-canteen law passed, and resists all assaults. The bill forbidding the sale of liquors in any Government building was attached in the House to the immigration law, in the expectation that the senators would kill it because their own privileges in the Senate restaurant would be curtailed; but the foxy old senators had an eye to business, too! They had constituents and so they voted to make all the area under the vaulting of the Capitol, as well as the roofs of the minor Government edifices everywhere, straight prohibition territory. Personally the senators decided they could get along with the closets in the committee rooms. Some of the House members resorted to desperate expedients, such as innocent looking mirrors on the walls, which opened into choice stocks of refreshments. But the law came and it will stay.

It is a truism of Washington that the worst topers make the most enthusiastic supporters of temperance legislation. It was a seasoned man of the world who from a generation's experience in the Senate, sagely remarked that he always made it a rule of his life to vote for everything that was asked for by a Christian, a temperance, or a women's organization. If the power of the speakership to hold up legislation could be broken and the House made as free as a town meeting, a prohibition law for the 300,000 inhabitants of this sixty-seven square miles of territory would be one of the first things thrown into the hopper, and in the light of present developments, of which no stay in the tide is now in sight, Congress could not reject it. This is only one of the by-products of the temperance issue as it is now arising in American politics."

Under the head of "Can't Apply Old Theories to New Conditions: The New England of the Puritans and Pilgrims is Gone," the Boston Sunday Post of October 5th, 1908, had this admirable statement made by John William Hamilton, recently appointed Bishop in charge of New England Methodist interests:

"Conditions have changed in New England and all its large centers," says Bishop Hamilton. "None of the old theories can be applied to the new conditions.

The New England of the Puritians and Pilgrims is gone. We have an entirely new population with one-half a million foreigners, a number which now exceeds that of the so-termed native New Englanders.

All these immigrants come from different sections of the world and bring with them the problems of the different sections from which they come.

It is a mistake to imagine that these foreigners are inimical to our institutions. They come here with the expectation of becoming Americans. They are usually here not more than five years before they are naturalized with the equal rights of all Americans.

While this population comes with these honest aspirations it would be unfortunate for us here, who are in the minority, to be prejudiced against them and to throw hindrances in their way. These new comers are more cosmopolitan and less provincial than we are, and by far less prejudiced.

They wish to mingle socially, politically and, to a certain extent, religiously with us.

The first thing for the church to recognize is that these immigrants are men and human, as worthy of sympathy as are we who were reared here. They are to be treated as our best friends. If we do not take this stand, barriers will be raised that will embarrass us more than them. Soon it will be the question of what they shall do with us, and not what we will do with them.

The first move in the solution of this problem is not to gather them all into the native churches, but to permit them to congregate in their respective nationalities. The churches must open rooms and have buildings for their comfort and entertainment. They must lead these strangers to feel the hospitality of the people among whom they have settled down. They have come here expecting to change their habits. They will be found to yield very readily to their environment.

The tendency of the times is towards liberalism, wider sympathy, more universal helpfulness, a more inclusive and a less exclusive attitude among Christians

I do not believe that there is a falling off in the seriousness of religious thought among the younger people. Young men and young women of today are just as religiously inclined as are their fathers and mothers.

The time has come when not the positive law but the rearing of ethical standards must be enacted as the guide to people's conduct.

Society is different from what it was a hundred years ago. We had not the sets and the caste which pervail today.

In the days of the Puritan everything done apart from the sanction of the church was termed lawlessness. Today we must change and we can do so without lowering the ethical standards."

In the most shocking contrast with the temperate, tolerant, and broadly conscientious spirit of this statement, are the utterances of the Wild West Fanatic who promises to lead America and mankind out of the Egypt of bondage to rum into the Holy Land of sobriety, sanctity and salvation, once that he can press the presidential button which will signal extinction of the liquor interest over the entire planet. Mr. E. W. Chafin, figuring as the exponent of inconceivable misapprehensions, misrepresentations, and mendacities, tells the tale of an idiot to the desperate zealots of prohibition with the gay abandon of lunacy. Speaking in Boston, and in Beverly, on Sunday, October 25th, 1908, he said:

"Christian civilization is nothing but the law of God transferred to the statute books, and when the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount are incorporated into the statute laws of the United States we will be the greatest nation on the face of the earth.

All we are as a national people we owe to the church and the school—religion and education. I am not going to give any credit to our form of government, our Constitution, to political parties or statesmanship. Some of the South American republics have even better constitutions than we have, but they amount to nothing in the eyes of the civilized world because they haven't the Christian Sabbath, the church and the school.

Our kind of civilization came with the Mayflower. The Puritans came here and established religion on a new basis—religion with education. And let us not forget that our entire school system in this country was given us by the church.

In the first 140 years after they landed the Pilgrims built all the churches, sent out all the missionaries, founded our school system, founded Harvard College, and established all the newspapers. And the result was that they swallowed up all the other nationalities and we speak the English language today because the Puritans preached the gospel from an English Bible.

The Declaration of Independence was preached in a Congregational church ten years before Thomas Jefferson thought of it. The Constitution of the United States was ratified in Congress by a

majority of 19. In that Congress were 20 preachers, every one of whom voted for the Constitution. If they had not we might not have had a nation today.

Our form of government was given us by the Presbyterian church. It was the church, not statesmanship, that built this country. The discipline of the Methodist church has more good laws in it than any statute book in the land, and all that is good in our form of government was drawn from the church.

Some day we will make it as illegal to sell liquor as it is to sell black men as slaves. And then you will see one of the greatest revivals ever seen on the face of the earth. And it will sweep over the world and the other nations will follow our example and destroy the liquor traffic.

We are the chosen people of God. That is why God has put in here all the nations of the earth to live in unity, and preserved for us the wealth of the world. We have the wealth and the consecrated army of young people, and if we do what we ought to do we will give the gospel of Jesus Christ to all the peoples of the world in 30 years. That is our mission.

We are going to have the grandest race of people the world has ever seen in 50 or 100 years from now. We will have all the races of the world mixed up and the result will be wonderful. It took the blood of six races to make Theodore Roosevelt the strenuous man he is. Fifty years from now all the people will be like him.

This is a fight for the higher civilization. We are face to face with a fight against the liquor traffic. It is the arch enemy of the Christian church, the school and the home.

The church stands for everything that is good, and the liquor traffic for everything that is bad. There are 1,000 churches in Chicago, with the best preachers in the country, but it is hard to get new blood to fill the places of those who die off. There are 7,200 saloons in Chicago and for the 5 per cent of the young men who are in Chicago churches, there are 95 per cent in the saloons.

When we get the educated Christian conscience of American citizenship we will put a four-line amendment to the Constitution that will destroy the liquor traffic.

It is for the church to fight against the liquor traffic, and if we do not do it we fail in the purpose of Almighty God and we fail as a nation. If we do fight, in 50 months there will not be a saloon in this country, other countries will follow our lead, the English-speaking people will dominate the world, and the heathen will become our heritage."

The gush of ignorance, imagination, and insanity in this story of our past, and prophecy of our future, is simply appalling. No fact of our Puritan story, of our Bible worship, of our vigor of Sabbath observance, of our church organization repressive of independence and freedom, and of our schools, our citizenship, and our social order, is more conspicuous and certain than the monstrous errors and mistakes, and crimes standing to the discredit of religion, on lines the last, the most deplorable and detestable demonstration of which appears in prohibition. What clearer proof of disgraceful failure of church developments could there be than 1,000 churches very largely moribund, against more than seven times that number of saloons, with 95 per cent of the Chicago young men in saloon social communion, and only 5 per cent in church communion? There could not be an exaggeration more preposterous than the prophecy of a whole race of Roosevelts, either in 50 years or in 50 centuries. It is not at all the fact that the nationalities in America speak the English language, or that the English Bible has had any influence in that direction. The falsification is simply scandalous which represents that the South American republics amount to nothing in the eyes of the civilized world, or that want of our Sabbath, church and school depresses and degrades them. But the champion lie of this wild talk is the declaration of immediate universal revivals, reforms, regeneration complete and final, if prohibition could be carried as a political vote. Such a vote, however carried, would be a rascal hypocrisy too rotten to stay in force, or even in form, for any appreciable results. It is perfectly just to say:

A temporary craze for prohibition similar to the present one has been experienced in this country before and the results have been disastrous. What disgrace has been thrust upon Maine by a prohibition, which is prohibition by law only, which countenances the underground dive and the jug. Prohibition has been gaining ground but the alcoholic consumption has been increasing. The official statistics show that the revenue derived from beer and spirits during 1906 was $199,035,193, and in 1907, $215,604,720. Does prohibition prohibit them?

Official statistics bear out the contention that the most temperate countries in the civilized world are those with the largest per capita consumption of wine, beer and spirits. There is less drunkenness in proportion to population in the United States than in some foreign countries, yet the consumption of liquor is steadily increasing. The government reports show that in 1906 the total consumption of liquors in the United States amounted to 1,874,225,407 gal-

lons, against 1,349,176,033 gallons in 1900. The importations of wines, spirits and malt liquors in the United States are also increasing every year.

Cardinal Gibbons, in speaking of prohibition, says:

"I am persuaded that it is practically impossible to put prohibition into effect in any large community.

"Laws like prohibition, that are certain to be violated, had best not be made, for incessant violation draws down upon them disrespect."

Rev. William J. Wasson, rector of the Grace Protestant Episcopal Church of Riverhead, L. I., has come out in a strong manner, stating that the prohibitionists are puritanical and that the Puritan is a "manufacturer and wholesale dealer in artificial sin."

"The church," said he, "cannot longer afford to have its name exploited in the manner in which it is being used by the prohibitionists. The church cannot acquiesce in the prohibitionist sentiment that a man cannot drink or handle liquor. The church and the prohibitionists are as far apart as the poles.

Intemperance can never be removed by the policeman's club or the sheriff's warrant. I am opposed to the whole prohibition philosophy, because I think it is an outrageous infringment on human rights.

I believe that the church and the liquor trade should stand shoulder to shoulder in this great fight. We need each other. There must be co-operation, without interference with the liberties and rights of American citizens."

Prohibition in Atlanta, Georgia, has in important respects proved a delusion and a snare. For one thing it means very large sums of money sent elsewhere for liquor to be drunk in Atlanta, and such drinking is worse than ever before. The mayor, who has "not taken a drink of anything intoxicating since 1884," testifies as follows:

"Nearly all the whiskey used is obtained from Chattanooga, Louisville, St. Louis, Baltimore, and other cities outside of the state. It is estimated by those who say they know, after an examination of the records of the postoffice department and the Southern Express Company, that $3,000 per day is being sent away from Atlanta for whiskey. Naturally this drain upon Atlanta is hurting the merchants.

The most evil effect of the prohibition law—and let me say here that I have never been a drinking man, and as a matter of fact have

not taken a drink of anything intoxicating since 1884—is that there is considerably more drinking among the young men in Atlanta now than before the prohibition law went into effect. The reason for this is that a great many of the young men now send to Chattanooga for whiskey and buy it by the case of twelve quarts. This they keep in their homes and in their rooms for the entertainment of their friends. I have been told by many young men in Atlanta that during the days of the open bar it was no effort for them not to drink, but that now it is a continual struggle with them, for the reason that nearly everywhere they go they are offered a drink of whiskey. I am giving you, however, hearsay evidence, because, as I have already told you, I do not drink.

In conclusion let me state that I believe the citizens of Atlanta would not vote today for the return of the standing bar. I believe our people would favor allowing wholesale houses to sell whiskey and wines by the quart, in order to prevent the necessity of sending out of the state for it, and I believe they would favor beer saloons and the sale of drinks in the cafes and restaurants with strict regulations, but their disapproval seems to be upon the standing bar where a man can pay 15 cents and gulp down a drink of whiskey."

There is no exception to the fact that any experience of prohibition, or local no-license, speedily shows that better regulation of license was the real need, and that prohibition never fails to do more harm than good.

The values represented in the liquor interest cannot be arrested in development in even one great country, save by a crime against humanity of appalling magnitude.

The Brewers, Maltsters and Distillers of the United States expend approximately $350,000,000 in the continuation of their business.

These industries pay annually state and government license amounting to $68,875,465. The capital invested in brewing and distilling in the United States is estimated at $612,571,588; the internal revenue paid on liquor business, $207,124,090, increase in revenue receipts over previous year, $16,444,051.

Brewers and Distillers furnish a livelihood for upwards of two and one-half millions of people and buy annually lumber, cooperage, building supplies, engines, boilers, and other manufactured goods having a value of $150,000,000, and pay in license, revenue and

other states, county, and city taxes, one-third of all taxes paid in the United States.

Facts such as these justify the appeal:

"Farmers and Workingmen! Can you afford to allow the prohibition fanatics to destroy the market for your grain and labor?

An attempt is being made throughout the country to build up a political party power at the expense of the farmer and workingman.

Do you intend to permit these crafty fanatics to rob you of the market of your grain and load you up with additional taxes which you cannot afford to pay?

Every farmer, every workingman, and every manufacturer in the United States should now assert his rights and use every effort to suppress this growing evil of prohibition and hypocritical humbug, which if allowed to prevail will create a financial crisis such as the world has never seen."

Bishop W. W. Webb of the Milwaukee diocese recently said:

"I do not think the Episcopal Church will ever take an active part in any campaign that may be made against the saloon. I do not think that its clergy will ever take a decisive stand on the question, but I do believe that the clergy will take a liberal view of the matter and will never come out with any pronounced opposition to the saloon.

The Episcopal clergy is inclined to regard with leniency the saloon in all its phases so long as the saloon is not detrimental, on its face, to public interest and morals. I believe that the general tendency of the Episcopal clergy is to favor, rather than oppose, the well-regulated saloon. The saloon, when at its best, certainly has many things in its favor. It is a gathering place of people, and in many instances of good people."

An expression of his views on Sunday closing, as the chief prosecuting officer of New York County, was asked of District Attorney W. T. Jerome, and his sane and prompt reply was in these words:

"It is the rankest nonsense to endeavor to make New York a puritan city. More than 75 per cent of our people are of foreign birth or extraction. It is a curious commentary on the American people that a noisy little band can dictate to the great mass of the people how they shall or shall not spend Sunday. It establishes what has often been asserted, that hypocrisy cuts quite a figure in our public life."

The double fact here is that religion creates a structure of form and fashion which tends to become an empty hypocrisy, but which custom will maintain, and fanaticism support and defend by terrorizing appeal to no matter what motives of selfishness or superstition.

The American native wine interest alone would shatter and turn back any success whatever of destructive prohibition.

The Grape Growers' Association of California have just published a book by their president, Andrea Sharboro, which gives some interesting information and statistics concerning the viticultural industry of the United States, and the merits of the proper use of wine at table.

He does not believe that the liquor problem will be settled by prohibition legislation, by exhortation of the minister who preaches total abstinence, by the substitution of temperance saloons, or by scientific temperance instruction in the public schools.

He contends that the home is the natural and rightful competitor of the drinking place, and declares that if our boys and girls are taught the proper use of wine from childhood, there will be no such thing as drunkenness. Wine, he says, should only be taken with meals, and then not pure, but diluted.

He particularly emphasizes a letter sent by him to Dr. Parkhurst, which says in part:

"Although I believe in temperance, I try to be temperate in my belief and to be sufficiently radical not to defeat the ends of my conservatism. I am warmly in sympathy with you in the attitude which you take in regard to wine as a substitute for whiskey. Judging from what I see in this country, and from what I know of the condition of things in Europe—which I have visited 25 times—I am decidedly of the opinion that the more wine that is produced in this country and the more freely it is transported from State to State, the less whiskey will be used, and the smaller the amount of drunkenness."

The volume, which is entitled "The Fight for True Temperance," is handsome from a typographical standpoint, containing illustrations which give one a good idea of the vineyards of California. There is also a supplementary chapter on "How to Use Wine," in which the writer appeals to the patriotism of the public to use American wines.

The grape growers of California have taken up in earnest a definite plan of action—that of "educating the public to the proper use of light wines." This action was brought about by the prohibition "craze" which has swept over certain sections of the country.

At the last monthly meeting of the Grape Growers' Association of California, held at the headquarters of the organization in the Italian-American Bank Building, San Francisco, flattering reports of progress were given by its officers. Andrea Sbarboro, president of the association, reported that branches of the State organization had been organized in Sonoma, Alameda, Santa Clara, Napa, Sacramento, and Yolo counties, and that the campaign of education begun by the association to increase the use of light native wines as a substitute for strong liquors has prospered.

In his address at a meeting of the Grape Growers' Association, Mr. Sbarboro outlined briefly the plans for counteracting the crazy prohibition movement, and in getting people to drink our light wines, as follows:

"You have got to send lecturers throughout the country," he said, "to preach the gospel of the grape and the temperate use of wine. You have got to take with you the great power of the press and disseminate in every home the truths that wine-drinking in moderation at the table means a healthy, invigorating, non-intoxicating beverage.

You have got to convince your law-makers that instead of passing vexatious prohibition laws, calculated to affect the sale of wine, they should make such laws as would promote the free distribution of wine to be used by families at home, just as freely as you permit the distribution of tea, coffee or milk. It will require some time to achieve this great desideratum, but while the consumption of wine will gradually increase, vineyards will be gradually planted and the production thereof will go hand in hand with the consumption.

In order to achieve this great undertaking it is necessary but for you to form a powerful organization and each of you contribute in proportion to your acreage in growing grapes to a fund to pay the expenses of this campaign of education."*

The situation created by such developments as those of the native wine interest, and in fact suggested by all experience of license, unquestionably demands reconsideration of the impressions as to license, and as to saloons also, which are of late acted on or proposed. George W. Curtis said in an Easy Chair essay many

*Any person who wishes a copy of "The Fight for Temperance," by Andrea Sbarboro, will receive one free by sending name and address to the Western office of the American Wine Press, No. 1265 Battery Street, San Francisco, Cal.

years ago: "Dram-selling is stigmatized by license no less than by prohibition. The object of license laws is to make an evil that cannot be abolished pay in a degree for its own consequences. The self-consciousness of the traffic is shown by the curtains and screens that conceal the frequenters of the dramshop from public view. It stigmatizes itself."

The final reform will undoubtedly be saloons under no stigma whatever, and certainly not under high license. "The Committee of Fifty for the Investigation of the Liquor Problem, organized in 1893," entrusted Mr. Raymond Calkins with the problem of "Substitutes for the Saloons," and Mr. Calkins executed his task with anything but adequate consciousness that reform can and must maintain the saloons, rather than seek to get into their field on the basis of rivalry, but with changes which will at once make a clearance of evils and make them more efficient for good than any of the suggested "substitutes" could be. Mr. Calkins first discusses "the possibility of offsetting and finally overcoming the social features of the liquor traffic," as if saloons must imply what is at present understood by the liquor traffic; and he undertook to commend "that system which it is believed will reduce to a minimum the social possibilities of the saloon," as if there could be no question of satisfactory, not repression but reform of the saloon. In sequel to this introductory discussion Mr. Calkins devoted by far the largest portion of his volume to "a review of the different methods by which the social life of the people may be satisfied apart from the saloon. This study," he said, "is intended to be an inclusive survey of those features of the social life of our American cities which rival the attractions of the saloon. In each case the effort is made to suggest specific and practical ways in which social substitutes for the saloon may be established, in which social opportunity for the people may be provided, which shall be wholesome, educative, and contributive to a higher form of individual and community life."

In his own summary Mr. Calkins says: "A careful study of the saloon as it exists today in our American cities has revealed the fact that it is performing a double office, it is satisfying a twofold thirst: it is meeting the physical craving for intoxicating liquor, but it is also meeting the thirst for fellowship, for amusement, and for recreation. Not only is the saloon performing such a service, but it has, or has had, the field practically to itself: in a word, it has had handed over to it by the community the monopoly of the social life of the majority of American wage-earners.

There are various ways of verifying such an assertion. One is to look at the patronage of our saloons today. Investigation in Boston in 1895 revealed the fact that no less than two hundred and fifty thousand of Boston's inhabitants, or about fifty per cent, daily visited the saloons of that city. This was supposed to be an exaggerated estimate; but in 1898 a very careful census taken by the city of Chicago revealed the fact that nine hundred thousand, or over fifty per cent of the population, daily frequented the saloons of that city. When one looks at these figures closely, bent upon discovering the cause of such a hold of the saloon on the community, he discovers that the saloon is ministering to a much deeper desire than that for alcoholic liquors; nothing less than the satisfaction of the deeper thirst for fellowship and recreation can adequately explain so large a patronage as this.

A concrete and thorough examination of the saloon itself verifies such a conclusion. An inquiry which has been carried on in cities of all sections of the country, which has included every type of saloon in each city, has revealed **the immense importance of the saloon as a social center.** Whatever its particular character may be, the saloon as such offers to its patrons a social rendezvous; it provides them at a minimum of cost with a sure stimulus to sociability. and its atmosphere is one of social freedom. Besides these general advantages, the saloon affords certain specific and valuable opportunities apart from the provision of liquor. Some of these features are intended directly for amusement and recreation. Tables and cards are frequently supplied by the proprietor, and sometimes card rooms. Reading is not so common, but the daily papers are by no means rare. The saloons are the headquarters for athletic information; they are the centers of political activity; they are the only labor bureaus that many workingmen know anything about; they take the place of the social club. Many of them provide adjacent rooms where labor unions and lodges may meet. Nearly all provide a so-called 'free lunch' where, either without extra cost or for a small amount, sufficient food is furnished to satisfy an ordinary appetite. In these and in many other ways, the saloon has intrenched itself in the social life of the people. It is nicely planned to meet needs which are not met in any other way, and the social importance of the saloon is practically the same whatever may be the legislative system under which it exists. Such, in a word, is the social side of saloon life as it presents itself today in all of our American cities."

Upon this exhibit Mr. Calkins remarks that "it goes without

saying that the liquor dealers are not the proper persons to have charge of the social life of our American working people, and that the liquor saloon is not the proper place for the social instinct to find its satisfaction. The saloon," he says, "stands at the same time for the source of the city's crime and the center of much of its social life. This first part of this statement few will question. That the latter part is also true will become apparent to anybody who will carefully examine the saloon as it exists and then will search for other existing agencies which are performing anything like the same social service. They are not to be found. As yet adequate substitutes for the social benefits which thousands of people actually derive daily from the saloons have not been developed. It is to this problem that the experience, the wisdom, and the wealth of those interested in social progress must now be directed."

The value of Mr. Calkins' testimony to the beneficient character of the existing saloons will long and increasingly command the appreciation and gratitude of adherents of the Christ Gospel of social justice, which through all the ages of faith churches of every name have turned their back upon. But for the problem of crime Mr. Calkins speaks upon impressions which disable him from just judgment, since the question is not of the historic liquor dealer and the existing saloon, but of the case which reform may be expected to create. It is deplorable to a degree that so capable an inquirer and so conscientious a reporter should come at the supreme problem of human society with vision blurred to the extent shown in the following statement:

"The negative approach to the problem is by the legislative repression of the social side of the saloon life. Can a system of liquor legislation be devised which shall extirpate the social function of the saloons? This question may safely be answered in the affirmative. Experimentation in liquor legislation has developed a system under which liquor selling may be made as prosaic as any retail grocery business, and a saloon as devoid of social attractions as a dry goods store. It would be possible to place upon the statute books of all our cities without delay a liquor law which would effectually annihilate the social features of the saloon.

The cardinal principle in such legislation is the **removal of the element of profit from the sale of liquor.** Here we may say the root of the whole matter rests. Once permit men to sell liquor for the money they can make out of it, and the attractiveness and social features of the saloon life are bound to follow. With an eye to larger profits the dealer will seek by every imaginable method to stimulate

his sales. It will not be possible for the state by subsequent legislation appreciably to diminish the social attractiveness of the saloons when once the fatal error has been made of delivering over to men the liquor monopoly for money-making purposes. Under a low license system the saloons multiply, and enter into lively competition with each other, and thus increase in attractiveness. If the State imposes a high license, then the saloon keeper not only has to pay the expenses of rental and wares and services, but in addition he has to pay to the State from $1,000 to $2,000, and he must make his profit beside. The State cannot expect its treasury to be reimbursed, and at the same time demand that the liquor dealers abstain from their methods of increasing their income. There is no way of diminishing the social activity of the saloon so long as liquor selling and money getting are put together in the same system.

The retention of the element of profit is the objection to existing systems of governmental control of the liquor traffic.

But with a scheme of low license, of wide distribution of licenses to sell, and of saloons under church and charity direction, there can be no question of annihilating the social features of the saloon. After a review of schemes more or less doubtful Mr. Calkins finally says:

"Another plan has been suggested. It has been proposed that temperance saloons recognize the demand for alcoholic stimulant as legitimate, and provide good beer and light wines to be sold with discretion and with **no attempt to make profit. This plan is already** in operation in England. The Bishop of Chester and other influential persons organized in 1897 the **People's Restaurant House Association,** the aim of which is to establish canteens and refreshment houses at large public works where liquor shall be distributed under right conditions.

"This association, which has done good work in England on what we may well believe to be right principles, has not been systematically initiated in America. Yet it may be said to present a practicable plan for proceeding at once to better the conditions under which intoxicants are sold without waiting for further legislation.

"It will fall to churches, temperance organizations, and private philanthropies that are not looking for a return on capital invested, to form lunch-room or coffee-house associations, and to plant lunch rooms or restaurants in localities where saloons are abundant and where the saloon free lunch is drawing all the trade." But why

not say to form saloons of the right type in place of those of wrong type?

Headlights of New Knowledge.

For research in the highest degree worthy of respect the volumes on "The Liquor Problem" undertaken by "The Committee of Fifty" come as near as any report of investigations yet made to an up-to-date review of questions which are equally difficult and important. From the volume published as "A Summary of Investigations Conducted by the Committee of Fifty," the following testimonies are drawn:

The Physiology of Alcohol.

"The **ultimate effects upon man of the moderate use of alcoholic drinks** cannot be ascertained with much accuracy for short periods of time. We have no trustworthy data as to the proportion of total abstainers, occasional drinkers, regular moderate drinkers, and positively intemperate persons in the United States. From such information as we have, it seems probable that of the adult males in this country **not more than 20 per cent. are total abstainers,** and not more than 5 per cent. are positively intemperate in the sense that they drink to such excess as to cause evident injury to health. Of the remaining 75 per cent., the majority, probably at least 50 per cent. of the whole, are occasional drinkers, while the remaining 25 per cent. might, perhaps, be classed as regular moderate drinkers. In the majority of these occasional drinkers and in many of the regular moderate drinkers, such as those whose drinking is limited to one or two glasses of wine at dinner or of beer at the end of the day, no especial effect upon the health seems to be observed either by themselves or by their physicians."

"The regular moderate drinkers use mainly light wines; the occasional drinkers chiefly whiskey and beer.

"Men use alcoholic drinks mainly because of their effect on mental action, and especially upon the emotional faculties. The taste and odor of the drink, its stimulating action on the digestive tract, the circulation, etc., are minor considerations affecting the preference for particular forms of drink. Sometimes the use of such drinks is due to a special desire to increase intensity of consciousness,—more often it is due to a desire for the sedative and quieting action which wine or beer, taken with dinner at the end of the day's work, exert upon mental tension or sensations of bodily fatigue.

"The question as to the **amount** of alcoholic drinks which can be used freely by the average adult without producing bad results

is a difficult one, because individuals differ greatly in their susceptibilities to injurious effects from such drinks. It seems probable that there is such an **average permissible quantity** of alcohol, the minimum estimate of which is a glass of wine or a pint of beer in the twenty-four hours. The English standard, as formulated by Anstie, is the equivalent of one and one-half (1½) ounces of absolute alcohol per day, or about three ounces of whiskey, or half a bottle of claret or Rhine wine, or four glasses of beer, it being understood that this is to be taken only at lunch and dinner, and that the whiskey is to be well diluted.

"At least one-third of an ounce of alcohol, diluted to ten per cent., must be taken before any departure from the normal course can be detected in the average adult, and while the effects vary with the dose, it has yet to be shown that harm is done when the dose is less than that required to produce an effect in psychological and physiological tests of divergence from the normal.

"If all substances known to be injurious in large doses are to be entirely given up on the assumption that small doses are also injurious, then all condiments and spices must be removed from our tables. Even sugar in concentrated solution is a powerful cell poison. Certain poisons are normally present in our tissues in such quantities that they subserve no harmful but rather a beneficial purpose. Such are the active principles of the thyroid gland and of the suprarenal capsules, both of which are far more powerful poisons than alcohol; that is, their lethal dose is several hundred times smaller.

"There are good grounds for believing that alcohol itself is always being produced in small quantities in the course of bacterial fermentation in the intestinal canal, that it is, in fact, **normally present in the healthy organism.**

"In the table showing the proportion of alcohol present in certain drinks, there are included a few of the so-called patent medicines which have a large sale in the New England States. It will be seen that some of these drinks, under the names of bitters, celery compound, sarsaparilla, etc., contain a greater percentage of alcohol than ordinary wines and beers and are consumed in quantities so large that they must be classified as beverages rather than as medicines, under which name they are commonly sold. As as exemple, it may be stated that 300,000 bottles of Ayer's Sarsaparilla are sold annually in Massachusetts, and as this contains **21.5 per cent. of alcohol,** by weight, it is clear that many people are partaking pretty

freely of an alcoholic drink without, perhaps, being aware of it.*

"The sale of these beverages is greater in those States having prohibitory liquor laws than in those not having them, and their popularity is due almost entirely to the stimulating effects of the alcohol which they contain."

"In view of what is known as to the effects of the moderate or occasional use of alcoholic drinks upon man, much of the methods and substance of the so-called scientific temperance instruction in the public schools is unscientific and undesirable. It is not in accord with the opinions of a large majority of the leading physiologists of Europe is shown by the statement printed on page 18, volume i, of the report of the Physiological Aspects of the Liquor Problem. This appears to us to be a matter of grave importance.

"It is not desirable to attempt to give systematic instruction to all children in the primary schools on the subject of the action of alcohol or of alcoholic drinks.

"This teaching should not be made a special, isolated matter, but should be a part of some elementary instruction in physiology and hygiene, and all that is really useful and desirable can be given in a brief time, equivalent to a few lessons, following the lessons on food, and in this connection the fact should be emphasized that there is such a thing as **intemperance in food** as well as in drink, the former not infrequently leading to the latter.

"It should not be taught that the drinking of one or two glasses of beer or wine by a grown-up person is very dangerous, for it is not true, and many of the children know by their own home experience that it is not true.

"In looking at the liquor problem from an educational point of view, one is impressed with the fact that many of those who are seeking to reform the drinking habits of the community by educational methods have failed to grasp the true educational nature of the temperance movement, a movement which, to be of permanent value, must be based upon a strengthening and upbuilding of the character of the individual, and not upon the amount and nature of the information imparted with regard to the physiologicacl action of alcohol. With the terrible effects of the abuse of alcoholic drinks constantly before one's eyes, it is of comparatively little importance

---

*Paine's Celery Compound .....17.
*Ayer's Sarsaparilla.....21.5
*Hood's Sarsaparilla.....15.8
*Greene's Nervura.....14.2

what one believes about the physiological action of alcohol on digestion or on heat production. On the other hand, the presence in every community of a large number of healthy and vigorous individuals for whom a small amount of alcohol forms a portion of their daily diet makes it impossible to take seriously the statements, too frequently made, as to the danger of indulging in a single glass of wine or beer.

"No one can doubt that the abuse of alcohol constitutes a threat to our civilization, and that the history of mankind would have been very differently recorded had it been possible to eliminate all the crime, misery, and disease directly or indirectly traceable to alcoholic excess. It is no wonder, then, if thoughtful people, the world over, are engaged in vigorously combating this terrible social evil. Among the various agencies employed in conducting this campaign, the education of school children is, in this country, the one to which those engaged in the total abstinence propaganda have attached especial importance. In nearly all the States and Territories of the Union instruction in the physiological action of alcohol has been made compulsory, and, where text-books are used, they are usually made to accord with extreme total abstinence views. They are, moreover, often openly "indorsed and approved" by a well-known powerful total abstinence society. So powerful has been the pressure which this organization has been able to exert upon school committees that publishers often find it difficult to sell text-books which are not thus indorsed.

"With regard to these educational methods, it is important to observe that they receive little or no support from the members of the medical profession, who by their training are especially qualified to judge of the accuracy and value of the statements as to the physiological action of alcohol which form the important features of the text-books in question.

"Of the practical results of such instruction the teachers themselves are, of course, the best judges, and, as far as they have been consulted, the weight of their testimony is emphatically opposed to the so-called "Scientific Temperance Instruction" as now given in our schools.

"Now there is no reason to doubt that physicians and teachers are as anxious to check the evils of intemperance as are the most strenuous advocates of total abstinence, and it is, therefore, highly important to discover, if possible, some common ground upon which they and all other educated and intelligent people may take their

stand in working out an educational scheme relating to the physiological action of alcohol."

Vice and Crime From Use of Liquor.

"The effects of intemperance in promoting vice and crime are often mixed with the effects of many other causes, such as unhealthy occupations, bad lodgings, poor food, and inherited disabilities; and it is very difficult to disentangle intemperance as a cause from other causes of vice, crime, and pauperism."

"All restrictions on the licensed saloons have a tendency to develop illicit selling; but much experience has proved that illicit selling cannot get a large development by the side of licensed selling, if the police administration be at all effective. It is only **in regions where prohibition prevails that illicit selling assumes large proportions."**

"Of course we all know that drunkenness is bad. We all know of families ruined by the dissipation of their breadwinner. Such general facts are not to be sought for in such a study. Nevertheless, in spite of the vigorous efforts of nearly a century, the liquor problem is still with us. We know that, in spite of very drastic laws, **the liquor law which will really seriously check intemperance is still to be discovered.** This, at least, may be taken as the result of the investigation of the Legislative Sub-committee, which, after a most through study, culminated in a negative conclusion. We know that the efforts made by moral and religious agencies, great as have been their successes in individual cases, have not solved the problem."

"The **total product of all kinds of liquors in 1890 was** $289,775,639, of which $182,731,622 was represented by malt liquors, $104,197,869 by distilled liquors, and $2,846,148 by vinous liquors (p. 27). The capital invested in the liquor traffic of all kinds was estimated in 1896 at over $957,000,000 (p. 50), of which 59 per cent. was found in the retail trade exclusively, and 15 per cent. in the retail trade combined with some other business. The total revenue collected in 1896 by the Federal Government, States, counties, and cities, was about $183,213,124 (p. 65). It is estimated that no less than 191,519 proprietors of establishments are interested in different forms of the liquor traffic, and that they employ 241,755 persons. A great many of these people devote only a part of their time to the liquor traffic. It is estimated that it would have required 172,931 employees to carry on the business, if they had devoted their entire time to it (p. 51). Adding together the employees and the proprietors, we thus learn that the liquor traffic suffices to give employment to over

364,000 persons, and if we assume that each of these breadwinners maintains on the average a family of four persons besides himself, we have a sum total of over 1,800,000 persons deriving their support directly from the manufacture of and traffic in intoxicants, entirely apart from the farmers who produce the raw material, and the transportation agencies which transport it. This would represent a population as great as the combined population of New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Connecticut in 1890, and would be about three quarters of the population of the colonies at the time of the revolt against Great Britain. These figures give us some idea of the **magnitude of the economic interests represented by the traffic."**

"It was claimed, a generation ago by De Gerando, who wrote in 1839, that 75 per cent. of the pauper cases in the United States were caused by drink, while Charles Loring Brace says that two-thirds of the crime of every city are due to drink. A somewhat similar estimate is made by Mr. Boies, who says that alcohol is the direct or indirect cause of 75 per cent. of all crimes, and 50 per cent. of all the sufferings endured on account of poverty.

On the other hand, more recent investigations place the percentage, as a rule, very much lower. Mr. Charles Booth, in his monumental investigation into the population of East London, concludes that about 14 per cent. of the poverty in classes A and B of his investigation, and 13 per cent. in classes C and D, may be attributed to liquor. In his study of pauper cases in the workhouse of Stepney, he attributes 15 per cent. to drink and immorality.

"Most of the figures hitherto published for our country fall short even of this. The figures quoted by Professor Warner from various charity organization societies range from 21.9 per cent. to 4.9 per cent., but in only two cases out of twelve go above 14 per cent. The cases collected by the New York Charity Organization Society in 1897 show 13 per cent. of liquor cases, while similar societies in Baltimore and six other cities yielded about 6 per cent. Still smaller are the figures in Germany. The great investigation made in 1885 into the **causes of pauperism** by the Imperial Statistical Bureau claimed that in only 2 per cent. of the cases could the pauperism be attributed to the use of liquor, while Dr. Boehmert's study of 77 German cities gave the result as 1.3 per cent. As between these **extremes of 1.3 per cent. on the one hand and 75 per cent. on the other,** where does the truth lie?"

"The study of crime offers peculiar difficulties. Crime cannot be attributed to a single cause as easily as poverty. This fact has necessitated a somewhat complicated method of classification, under

which we have endeavored to ascertain, not only how far intemperance was a cause of crime, but also now far it was a first, second, or third cause, and also how far it was found combined with other leading causes, notably unfavorable environment and lack of industrial training, in bringing about crime.

"The danger of making sweeping statements with regard to intemperance as a cause of crime is nowhere better illustrated than in this section of our investigation, and the reader cannot be too strongly urged to study carefully for himself the tables and the explanation of them given.*

"The investigation covered 13,402 convicts in seventeen prisons and reformatories scattered throughout twelve States. It was conducted with great care, in many instances by the chaplains, in others by the superintendents of the institutions in question. Of the total number of cases thus investigated, it appeared that intemperance figured as one of the causes of crime in nearly 50 per cent. It was, however, a first cause in only 31 per cent. While, therefore, intemperance appears to contribute to crime in nearly half the cases investigated by us, a result which is strikingly confirmed by the investigation of the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor Statistics for that State, it was almost always only one of several causes, and appeared as a leading cause in less than a third, and as the sole cause in but 16 per cent."

Aspects of the Saloon.

"The evils of excessive drinking are well recognized, and yet the saloons seem to flourish in spite of these evils. We must, therefore, **analyze the saloon,** as we have analyzed the statistics of pauperism and crime, and **endeavor to learn its true nature.** The reports which have been made for us in several large cities, especially Chicago, New York, Boston, and San Francisco, concur in showing that the saloon, though supplying the means of intemperance, is not exclusively devoted to this purpose. Its character differs naturally with the locality in which it is situated, and with the nationality and occupation of its patrons, but it **generally attracts custom by ministering to the social wants of the poor man.** Here he finds companionship, recreation, literature, even kindness, and help in trouble. What more natural than that he should become its patron, even though the desire for drink may not be very strong? This is seen in the fact that **saloons flourish among** nationalities like the **Jews in New York,** which are noted for their moderation.

---

*In the larger work.

"The fact that **the saloon is more than a mere drinking place,** and that it supplies many legitimate wants besides the craving for intoxication, should be frankly recognized, and ought to be of help to those who are engaged in practical efforts to counteract the evils of intemperance."

"The large interests represented by the capital invested in the production and sale of liquors and the large number of persons who gain their livelihood in connection with it do not necessarily represent a force working for intemperance. They certainly indicate, however, some measure of the resistance which must be encountered in any effort to abolish or restrict the use of liquor, and they explain the success with which radical reformatory measures are often thwarted. Yet these figures, formidable as they are, are not altogether discouraging. The largest interests are represented by the least alcoholic beverages. In 1890 the manufacture of malt liquors gave employment to 34,800 persons and yielded a product of $182,-731,622; the manufacture of distilled liquors employed but 5,343 persons and yielded a product of but $104,197,869. In 1900 the value of malt liquors had increased to $237,269,713, and the persons engaged in their production to 46,685, while the value of distilled liquors had fallen to $96,798,443, and the producers to 4,383. And if we look at the consumption of liquors for a series of years, we find a marked decline in the more alcoholic varieties. It is, unfortunately, no longer true, as it was in 1896, that the per capita consumption of distilled liquors in the United States is declining, the amount having risen from 1.01 gallons in 1896 to 1.46 in 1903. But in 1840 the average was 2.52 gallons per capita. On the other hand, the consumption of malt liquors has risen from 1.36 gallons per capita in 1840 to 18.04 in 1903. Thus we find **a gradual substitution of lighter for stronger drinks.**

"This does not seem to be fortuitous. There are very powerful economic forces which almost compel moderation in modern industry. It does not seem too optimistic to say that a complete change has taken place in the habits of the wage-earning class since the early part of the century."

"It cannot be without interest to those who are especially active in the use of moral agencies of reform to learn that these agencies may often be powerfully reinforced by economic considerations. Our investigation shows, as we believe, that economic forces are already working in the direction of moderation which need but be stimulated and directed to become effective allies of the moral agencies which are attacking the evils of the liquor habit."

The Questions of Remedy.

"As regards the great body of drinkers in saloons, it seems hardly an exaggeration to say that the whole strength of the liquor traffic lies in the weakness of human nature on its social side.

"The study of the legislative aspects shows how inadequate, if not worse, is mere statutory prohibition: how it fails to touch any spring of evil; and how at best it can but support some remedial treatment based upon something other than legislation; something that finds deeper and sound hold in human nature on its social side.

"Obviously, the **questions of remedy** resolve themselves to two: those which are palliative of the visible evils that afflict or threaten society and tend to minimize and remove them as far as possible by some method and degree of repression, and those which go deeper and seek to remove the source of the evil by the redemption of human nature, procuring its action on a right ethical plane. In our mixed American communities, it is in the large and in a very definite sense a local problem, in that its aspects of evil and its remedial treatment vary with the character of the population, and what may be suited to or practicable under one set of conditions involving race, temperament, industrial, economic, and social conditions, may require much modification applied to different conditions. It therefore becomes practically impossible to dogmatize with universal acceptance, or to formulate rules of procedure everywhere equally applicable.

"To one observant of the manifold degredations and distresses caused by drink, and moved by divinely human pity and indignation alike to remedy the same, one of the greatest trials and difficulties is the necessary combination of patience with labor, the due mingling of discretion and zeal. The apostolic wrath that would have called down the consuming fire from heaven seems none too hot. But there can be no doubt that, however definite the aim or however severe the ultimate standard of the temperance reformer, so far at least as the effective action of the community within its proper lines of duty and right is concerned, he must be a more or less patient opportunist. He must move by such steps as are for the moment practicable, and from the secure basis of a recognized good so attained move forward to the next attainable better: the proper steps and their proper order being questions dependent on many locally varying considerations."

BOOK FIRST.

How Massachusetts Held a Grand Inquest on Prohibition in 1867.

The Petitions against state Prohibition in Massachusetts during the months of January, February, and March, 1867, remain a monumental instance of knowledge and wisdom, justice and humanity, applied to solution by Commonwealth law of the drink problem.

Hearings given, for four days in each week, from February 19th to April 3d, brought out the testimony of more than 120 witnesses, of whom John A. Andrew, as counsel for 30,000 voters of Massachusetts, said:

"They are of nearly all professions, and callings, men of learned pursuits and those devoted to the cares of busy life, scholars, clergymen, and statesmen, cultivators in the various sciences, and of wide renown, men of venerable years, and those of younger age. They are of the metropolis, the interior, the mountains of Berkshire, the valley of the Connecticut, the shores of Essex, the Islands and the Cape. They represent every phase of industry, of philanthropy, and of wisdom."

Twelve of the most eminent names of Harvard University, a list which cannot be duplicated today, and nineteen occupants of Boston pulpits, with an array of Commonwealth names in law, divinity, medicine, and charity, attested the desire of Massachusetts to repeal her experiment of prohibition.

"A Judicious License Law" Demanded.

As against Prohibition the 30,000 petitioners of 1867 asked for "enactment of a judicious license law for the regulation and control of the sale of spirituous and fermented liquors in the Commonwealth;" also for "such changes in existing laws concerning the sale of wines and liquors as shall allow inn-keepers to supply the wants of the guests of their houses, yet under such excise and regulation and subject to such supervision as shall be deemed needful for the public good;" and further from the State College of Pharmacy, 'representing that under the statutes in force it was impossible to legally conduct the business and perform its duties to the medical profession and the sick, and praying for such amendment of the

law as that apothecaries may be enabled to conduct their business in a legal manner."

Plea Against Prohibition by Ex-Gov. John A. Andrew.

The argument of John A. Andrew, which closed the hearing on the 3d of April, was not only the voice of statesmanship second to none the Commonwealth has ever known, but a digest of wise testimonies, of just counsels, of eloquent appeals, in regard to the use of alcoholic beverages, and the human rights wantonly disregarded. and ruthlessly trampled on, by Prohibition.

It is proposed in these pages to gather out of the eloquent masterpiece of Mr. Andrew the strong points of his argument, with such addition of facts, testimonies, and reasonings as are suggested by experience and study during the forty years since the Commonwealth overthrew Prohibition by a tremendous majority.

No-License Victory an Economic and Moral Disaster.

As a participator in the anti-prohibition campaign in Massachusetts of 1867, the present writer, with forty years further observation and study, could not but regard the No-License victory of December 9th last in Worcester as an economic and moral disaster; a miscarriage the worst possible of temperance zeal and energy; not a temperance, not a moral reform, not a philanthropic victory at all,—but a victory of the slums, the worst low groggery interests. pulled off with the aid of the best church and society endeavors to serve temperance by enforced closing of saloons. No lesson of half a century of varied experience is more certain and decisive than the agreement of extreme prohibition and the worst groggery interests in wanting No-License, and the need, for temperance, for suppression the utmost possible of the excesses more or less promoted by saloons, and of social uplift where it is most needed, of saloon regulation under Commonwealth law repressive of evil but not inimical to freedom.

Monstrously Unjust and Unwise Denial of Freedom.

The wrong of a step in public policy which suppresses all supply of ale, beer, and light wine to great numbers of good citizens in our restaurants and hotels, and at the same time promotes a vast low groggery trade in, and domestic use of, distilled spirits, could not well be greater.

There is no more reason for suppressing the use of ale, beer and light wines than there is for suppressing the use of tea, coffee and ice water. The extreme of No-License attempted in Worcester

under the existing law and the vote of December last is a monstrous violation not only of just rights of a vast number, but of common sense and good judgment.

I did my utmost forty years ago, as the minister of the First Parish in Medford, to secure the overthrow of state prohibition because I thought prohibition ineffective for temperance and in every way ill-judged, and today the case is far clearer than it was then, that what we want is a reasonable temperance, and that an extreme of prohibition defeats this every time.

What Worcester wants in the near future, and for definite permanence of good government, is to maintain municipal administration of high character, and under such government give restricted freedom in drink the same as in food. To draw the line against the evils of freedom does not require a monstrous suppression of table rights in public eating places, which are no more rum hells than the churches themselves.

Legitimate Restaurant Service Suppressed.

There could hardly be a more remarkable example of wanton injury recklessly inflicted, against every principle of justice and humanity, than the blow dealt to the Zaeder high class restaurant in Worcester by the combined No-License efforts of the prohibition zealots and groggery interests. The brothers Julius C. and Fred J. Zaeder inherited from their father, Benjamin Zaeder, a German saloon interest of exceptionally good character. Under the management of Mr. Julius Zaeder the business was radically changed from a place for German drink to a thoroughly high class place for food of the best quality with expert kitchen and table service, making the drink element secondary. During the last two years Mr. Zaeder has spent very heavily of his own money, a good many thousands, to perfect his equipment for high class banquet service to private parties, patrons who come to him for special dinners and suppers with no more reference to wine, ale, or beer than their home custom has made familiar. An inflexible promoter of social purity, Mr. Zaeder invariably insisted on proprieties the same as those of the best Worcester homes. The extent to which the traditions of the place are not only those of first class hotels but are specially German, makes service of food without wine, ale, or beer to a very large extent impracticable,—a half service not acceptable to the great majority of patrons. Hence a great falling off of business, and an enormous loss in a business as legitimate as any other, and very exceptionally respectable.

Honest and Honorable Merchant Interests Overthrown.

Among recent improvements in Mechanic street, Worcester, calculated to make it the best avenue of communication between the Railway Station and Main street, one of the most considerable has been the erection by the E. S. Pierce Company of a new building for their wine and spirits trade, at a cost of $50,000. June 9th, 1908, the head of the firm, Mr. E. S. Pierce, had been in the business in Worcester for thirty-three years, a business amounting to $300,000 a year, with the prospect of increase to be expected from large investment in improved facilities for trade operations. As a merchant and citizen Mr. Pierce had met every demand of the law and of general public interest, and was as legitimately counting upon a future of trade as any of the merchants in dry goods, clothing, boots and shoes, or coffee, tea, meat, and tobacco. Like all high-minded merchants in wine and spirits, he deplored the existence of a class of hardened, degraded drinkers, and the still worse class of wretched caterers of cheap poisons to such drinkers, whose opportunity comes, or by them is believed to come, under No-License. The experience of a third of a century had shown him two important aspects of the liquor question, first, that the ministers, churches, and prohibition zealots, with all their sincerity, enthusiasm, and energy, do not make votes to any appreciable extent, beyond their own lines as regular opponents of license; and, second, that the swing of any considerable body of voters, sufficient to carry an election, as that of December 10th, 1907, was carried in Worcester, is always effected, first, and in large part, by parties whose efforts to secure a license had not met with success; second, by the considerable number of other persons who, in one way or another, had a grievance against the existing license situation; and, third, by the large class of hardened, degraded drinkers who had as soon depend on the low groggery system as on the license system. The No-License gain in license wards last December was 789, making a difference of 1538 in the election, and more than accounting for the No-License majority. It was a slump to conditions desired by the worst elements of the community. The legitimate and honorable liquor interest was overthrown by the desperate, degraded interests taking advantage of the opportunity that was created by ill-advised prohibition fanaticism.

On the part of prohibition voters, putting their church, moral reform, and philanthropic pretentions into the most manifest co-operative alliance with the favorers of illicit sale, the promoters of

abuse of liquor at its worst, and even ordinary inevitable use of liquors made a good deal worse by the No-License conditions, no scandal could be greater, no miscarriage of judgment and zeal more deplorable. The honest and honorable wine and spirits merchant, incidentally involved in a year's destruction of business interests, while the worst form of the evils of drink are specially promoted.

Unfortunate Physiological Ignorance.

It is unfortunate that the physiology of intoxication has never been correctly taught, and that prohibition advocates should be in consequence unable to understand that when alcoholic beverages make men unable to walk straight and ready to fall down and go to sleep, the appearance which is naturally pronounced disgusting does not signify of necessity anything very different from the effect of ether, of eating heavily so far as being made sleepy is concerned; and that the average of injury from excess in eating, which no one pretends to interfere with, is far beyond that of any ordinary getting drunk. The drink declares itself to observation more unpleasantly, but the food declares itself more dangerously. Indigestion from excess in eating is a far more frequent cause of death than drunkenness.

It is to the last degree unjust to fasten a peculiar guilt on errors with drink, when other errors having even worse results pass unchallenged by the law, and even by instruction are very little noticed. Under the existing reign of ignorance and misapprehension the fresh air craze is doing more fatally effective harm than the drink passion is doing. The appalling record of New York city of 6434 deaths from pneumonia, besides 5493 from consumption, in eleven months, and the deaths for the first week of December for these two diseases at the rate of nearly forty thousand a year (39,468), consumption 337, and pneumonia 422, for the one week, is immensely beyond any ravages of the drink evil, bad as these are. There is more need a hundred times in Worcester of showing people how not to take cold, and what to do upon taking cold, than there is of amending in a just and proper way the evils of drink.

Relentless Calvinistic Fanaticism.

In a large part the no-license spirit is that of relentless Calvinism, asserting itself with very inadequate regard for justice, kindness, and good will towards the evil as well as the good. Under English law no license duly paid for through perhaps many years can be taken away without compensation, and ruthless robbing thou-

sands of wage earners of their livelihood is impossible. The only just, judicious, and humane thing is to appeal to the legislature for such change in the law as will put the whole matter of drink upon a basis possible to be established without wrong done, and favorable to gains for temperance without cruel, as well as unwise, violation of human rights.

A Crusade Against Justice.

It was promptly announced for Worcester, after the No-License victory of December last, that the citizens no-license committee of fifty had provided for a committee of five charged with the duty of preparing a plan of campaign for the enforcement of the no-license law after the first of May. This committee, it was stated, "will delve into the no-license law as it will apply to Worcester and work out some plan for campaigning for its enforcement to the letter."

If this meant action either favorable to permanent reform, or based in reasonable respect for justice, mercy and truth, no one could fail to rejoice in the prospect.

As a matter of fact it means nothing of the kind. The letter of the law is extreme injustice to vested interests which are as legitimate as any other, and in proportion as zeal for its enforcement succeeds there will be a swing backward of the pendulum at the earliest opportunity.

It is in the interest of temperance, even more than of justice to rights trampled on by no-license carried to the utmost extreme of the letter of the law, to lose no time in organizing an appeal to the legislature for changes in the state law under which municipal action can be taken with a view to mitigating the utterly unrighteous, unjust and cruel situation which the letter of the present law creates.

"Scribes, Pharisees and Hypocrites."

It is one of the mysteries of human nature that prohibition of a freedom which is for the most part as legitimate as any other, should make good men fiercely hysterical beyond all truth, decency and judgment. But from the day that the "Scribes, Pharisees and Hypocrites" of his time hounded the great Master of good teaching to his crucifixion, confident that pious service of God required it, pious heat against things either really wrong or supposed to be wrong, has made this mistake, and undoubtedly will continue to make it, until churches understand where they are at better a good deal than they commonly do.

Organized for communion behind closed doors, churches of

Protestants are not the schools of humanity which, under the law and spirit of Christ, they should be, and when from them there issue fomenters of disturbance, expecting to cudgel and coerce some class of outsiders, the spectacle is humiliating.

It is a curious fact that the church which has no use for hell as a religious motive, is foremost of all in giving the identical thing to dissenters from the prohibition creed.

The whole case of drinks and drunkenness can be dealt with now, under new light from the physiology of the animal system, with facts and arguments greatly more effective than the familiar ones for promoting temperance by persuasion, and at the same time absolutely conclusive of the utter wrong of prohibitive abridgment of freedom, the same for drink as for food.

Temperance Progress Hindered by Prohibition.

The present writer left a Unitarian pulpit near Boston over forty years ago on the question of "Temperance Without Prohibition," and the bigots who stoned him the best they could then are still with us. State prohibition had proved a crude mistake, and we overthrew it by a very great majority. But neither law nor instruction have made any real approach since that to a truly just and wise solution of the drink problem.

The matter is urgent, and the year before us ought to see under way work calculated to set in motion a movement of reformation of the sadly wrong system now in operation.

The crime at the bottom of the whole situation is that of fanaticism out with a knife against members of the legislature who yield an unwilling support to the present law, partly under coercion and partly because the wiser and easier path has not been pointed out. It is up to Cambridge, Lynn, and Worcester to lead in undoing the evil work of intemperate temperance, and in setting an example adapted at once to promote reasonable temperance and to safeguard rights of freedom now ruthlessly trodden under foot.

No-License in Worcester Impossible of Permanent Maintenance.

Whatever may be done in Worcester under no-license voted for one year, there is the greatest doubt whether the same vote can be repeated at the next election. A Swedish gentleman of exceptional intelligence, and ardently anxious for many years of no-license, has given out these words of frank statement of what the real situation will be found to be. He says with great force:

"It is not a question of swinging the city year after year, just because the no-license vote was an overwhelmingly large one this

year. The vote in other years has proven that license is in the majority with the voters of the line, those who vote every year without fail. Votes were cast in favor of the no-license side this year that were cast out of spite and with little regard for the merits of either license or no-license.

"Next year this spite will be removed, if for no other reason than because the voter has become frightened at the result of the no-license swing. Many voters in Worcester today are kicking themselves because they pleased to place a no-license vote in the ballot box. If I were allowed to venture an opinion I would say that the no-license people today have little to rejoice over, when the future is taken into consideration.

"This sounds like a strong statement, but the meaning is this: They scored a victory, or, better still, a victory was scored for which they worked hard. Now that victory is nothing definite. It means that Worcester will be dry for one year, but as I said before, that counts as nothing.

"With no-license a large amount of money is taken from the income of the city, and this in turn means higher taxes. Here is where the voter scores. You can explain that the money he pays over the bar amounts to much more than the slight increase on a thousand in taxes, but he will tell you in turn that the money he pays over the bar brings back its equivalent.

"The only answer to this comes under the head of a temperance lecture, and no-license was never secured by means of a temperance lecture or lectures. There has got to be something stronger than talk. The place no-license hits him is in the pocket and the place to repair the injury is in that same pocket.

"Another argument is that the sociability of the saloon is worth much more than the money spent in drinks. A place warm and cozy where friends can talk over the news of the day and have a companionable talk. The social life appeals to more perhaps than the tax rate side.

"One thing hinges upon another. No matter how strictly the law is enforced, the contention I make is that, deprive a man of his social enjoyment or hit him in his money pocket, and he will retaliate by taking measures to prevent such deprivation. It is a side that seems to have gone without notice, and I wished to place it before those interested."

This is decisive counsel, a just presentation of the real facts, disregard of which will injure temperance interests, disable churches

from service of the mass of the community, and react badly upon politics.

Good City Government the First Necessity.

The first necessity of the cities of the Commonwealth is non-partisan union of the best elements of the Democratic and Republican parties, to secure municipal administration on the basis of strong conservative suppression of evils which under corrupt politics have full swing. Republican administrations, even if not machine made, are insecure, unless they cater more or less to evil elements, and administrations wholly Democratic inevitably mean an overweight of evil elements. In thorough non-partisan policy is the only hope of good city government. The cause of regulation by license of the sale of liquors has been wrecked by administration blind to wise counsels and reckless of evil courses.

Temperance Secured by Two Agencies.

But none the less the aims of temperance must be carried to such degree of success as human nature, limitations, and circumstances permit, through reliance upon two agencies, reasonable sale regulated by license, and influences by instruction, persuasion, and varied moral, social, and industrial pressure tending to abstinence, or to use strictly regulated by wise restraint. It is to the last degree futile to insist on total abstinence under either physiological or moral law. The physical necessity cannot be proven, and the moral duty has no basis of indisputable principle.

BOOK SECOND.

Two Flagrantly False Ideas.

Fermented and spirituous liquors, beverages which are stimulants by reason of the alcohol which they contain, and which are of universal human use from experience of the need and value of stimulants, are condemned for free use and prohibited from free sale, under a theory which assumes and asserts two flagrantly false ideas, the injurious, toxic, or poisonous operation of alcohol in drink, and moral obligation not to promote, permit, or fail to prohibit, the use, the sale, or the toleration of beverages made stimulant by the presence of alcohol.

Dr. Carpenter Falsely Makes Alcohol "Essentially Poisonous."

Dr. Carpenter, an English physiologist of some reputation, is quoted by the advocates of prohibition as having declared "That the action of alcohol upon the animal body in health is essentially poisonous"; and upon this these advocates further affirm "that whatever is true of the excessive use of alcohol is true also in proportionate degree of the moderate and occasional use."

These statements might be true without in the least justifying interference with the vast mass of persons who cannot be convinced that they are true, or who are of the opinion that conditions of the animal system may call for use of the exact poison which alcohol is supposed to be. Dr. Carpenter himself cites the case of a celebrated Italian, Cornaro, who from his fortieth year to his death restricted himself to a daily allowance of twelve ounces of solid food and fourteen ounces of wine. Of this experiment, continued for nearly sixty years, Dr. Carpenter says:

"The smallest quantity of food upon which life is known to have been supported with vigor during a prolonged period, is that of which Cornaro states himself to have subsisted. This was no more than twelve ounces a day, chiefly of vegetable matter, with fourteen ounces of light wine, for a period of fifty-eight years."

"Observe the proportion of wine in this diet, and then ask how in the face of such facts can Dr. Carpenter deny the nutritive value of alcohol," is the pertinent comment of Mr. G. H. Lewis, in his "Physiology of Common Life."

Dr. Carpenter Contradicts Himself.

And in fact Dr. Carpenter himself recedes from his extreme assertion quoted above, in the following passage at the close of his Physiology of Temperance and Total Abstinence:

"Whilst the habitual use of alcoholic liquors, even in the most moderate amount, is likely (except in a few rare cases) to be injurious, great benefit may be derived in the treatment of disease, from the medicinal use of alcohol in appropriate cases."

"Injurious" is a very different matter from "essentially poisonous," and greatly beneficial medicinal use may have a very large application. In fact, Dr. Carpenter himself comes finally to say that there is "a class of individuals who can scarcely be regarded as subjects of disease, but in whom the conditions are essentially different from those of health. These are such," he goes on to say, "as, from constitutional debility, or early habits, or some other cause that does not admit of specification, labor under an habitual deficiency of appetite and digestive power, even when they are living under circumstances generally most favorable to vigor, and when there is no indication of disordered action in any organ, all that is needed being a slight increase in the capacity for preparing the aliment which the body really needs. Experience affords ample evidence that there are such cases, especially among those engaged in avocations which involve a good deal of mental activity; and that, with the assistance of a small but habitual allowance of alcoholic stimulants, a long life of active exertion may be sustained, whilst the vital powers would speedily fail **without** their aid, not for the want of direct support from them, but for the want of the measure of food which the system really needs, and which no other means seems so effectual in enabling it to appropriate.... To withhold the assistance of alcoholic stimulants (it is in their very mildest form, such as that of botter ale, that they are most beneficial), would often be to condemn the individuals in question to a life-long debility, incapacitating them from all activity of exertion in behalf of themselves or others, and rendering them susceptible to a variety of other causes of disease. For it seems to be the peculiar character of this condition that no other medicine can supply what is wanting with the same effect as a small quantity of an alcoholic beverage, taken with the principal meal of the day."

The Scheme of Nature Provides for the Use of Alcoholic Stimulant.

Dr. Carpenter's concession opens a door upon fields of human experience too many and too wide to permit treating as at all exceptional the condition for relief of which alcoholic stimuulant not only

may but must be supplied. The use of such stimulant is provided for in the scheme of nature, and the sole question needing to be considered is how to direct, control, and perfect this use. As Mr. G. H. Lewes wrote to the Westminster Review of July, 1855: "No nation known to us has ever passed into the inventive condition of even rudimentary civilization without discovering, and, having discovered, without largely indulging in, the stimulus of alcohol. Man discovers fermentation as he discovers the tea plant or the coffee plant."

Prof. Johnson on the Value of Ardent Spirits.

An authority of just weight, ranking much higher than Dr. Carpenter, Prof. Johnson, author of The Chemistry of Common Life, bears this testimony:

"It is ascertained of ardent spirits, First, That they directly warm the body, and, by the changes they undergo, supply the place of food—of the fat and starch for example—which we usually eat. Hence, in Germany, a schnapps with a slice of lean dried meat. make a mixture like that of the starch and gluten in our bread, which is capable of feeding the body. Second, That they diminish the absolute amount of matter usually given off by the lungs and the kidneys. They thus lessen, as tea and coffee do, the natural waste of the fat and tissues, and they necessarily diminish in an equal degree the quantity of ordinary food which is necessary to keep up the weight of the body. In other words, they have the property of making a given weight of food go further in sustaining the strength and bulk of the body. And, in addition to the saving of material thus effected, they ease and lighten the labor of the digestive organs, which, when the stomach is weak, is often a most valuable result."

Alcohol "A Stimulant Food," Says Dr. Anstie.

Dr. F. E. Anstie, in his "Stimulants and Narcotics,' a work of the highest scientific authority, says of alcohol as a stimulant food. that it promotes "the same quiet and perfect action of the vital functions" which the oxygen of respiration, "the great natural stimulus of life," promotes; and further he says: "A stimulus promotes or restores some natural action, and is no more liable to be followed by morbid depression than is the revivifying influence of food." "Alcohol taken alone or with the addition alone of a small quantity of water, will prolong life greatly beyond the period at which it must cease if no nourishment or water only had been given. In acute diseases it has repeatedly supported not only life, but even the bulk of the body during many days of abstinence from common

foods; and in a few instances persons have supported themselves almost solely on alcohol and inconsiderable quantities of water for years."

"We may be at a loss to explain the chemistry of its action, but we may safely say that it acts as a food."

"The **narcotic** dose of alcohol is alone responsible for the symptoms of depressive reaction of drunkenness. Had a merely stimulant dose been administered, no depression would have occurred. What depression is there, as an after consequence, of a glass or two of wine taken at dinner, or a glass of beer taken at lunch, by a healthy man? **Absolutely none whatever."**

Teetotallism Produces Ill Health.

Another of the highest English authorities, Dr. William Brinton, in a treatise on Food and Digestion, says:

"If we take the customary life of those constituting the masses of our inhabitants of towns, it is singular how few healthy teetotallers are to be met with in our ordinary inhabitants of cities. The author is obliged to confess that he has hitherto met with but very few perfectly healthy middle-aged persons, successfully pursuing an arduous metropolitan calling under teetotal habits. On the other hand, he has known many total abstainers, whose apparently sound constitutions have given way with unusual rapidity when attacked by a casual sickness."

Special Food Value of Alcohol.

Some French experiments of M. M. Lallemand and others, much relied upon forty years ago by prohibitionists, gave no just results because they proved nothing more than the effect of narcotic doses of alcohol. Dr. Anstie, denying the validity of such experiments, and comparing alcohol with ether and chloroform, said of alcohol that it seems as if it "was intended to be the medicine of those ailments which are engendered of the **necessary** every day evils of civilized life, and has therefore been made attractive to the senses, and easily retained in the tissues, and in various ways approving itself to our judgment as **a food."**

An able English medical critic of the French experiments, in a Cornhill magazine article of September, 1862, said:

"It is idle to appeal to a set of imperfect chemical or physiological experiments, and to decide on their evidence, that we ought to call alcohol a medicine or a poison, but not a food. On the part of the medical profession, I think I may say that we have long since

begun to believe that those medicines which really do benefit our patients act in one way or another as foods, and that some of the most decidedly poisonous substances are those which offer, in the form of small doses, the strongest example of a true food action.

"On the part of alcohol, then, I venture to claim that, though we all acknowledge it to be a poison if taken during health in any but quite restricted doses, it is also a most valuable medicine-food. The chemical evidence is as yet insufficient to give any complete explanation of its exact manner of action upon the system; but the practical facts, are as striking as they could well be, and there can be no mistake about them."

Judgment Pronounced By Dr. James Jackson.

Dr. James Jackson, in his Letters to a Young Physician, spoke with the authority of medical distinction second to none other in America, when he said:

"I would never order the medicinal employment of spirits and wine to one whom I suspected to be deficient in prudence and self-control. But I have often directed the use even of brandy. I do not call the risk very great of such prescriptions. In regard to the benefit, in some cases of dyspepsia, and in various other cases, I have not any doubt. I have repeatedly seen very great benefit from giving wine to young children. The benefit has been particularly marked in some children struggling feebly through the period of dentition.

"I believe that very many persons are benefited by the juice of the grape. Moreover, I believe that persons disposed to intemperance are not to be restrained from indulging their vicious propensity by the abstinence of their more prudent neighbors."

BOOK THIRD.

Ex-Gov. John A. Andrew's Denial that Drunkenness is the Parent Cause of the Social Evils.

In the masterly plea against prohibition made by John A. Andrew in 1867, a hundred pages were devoted to argument against the popular impression that drunkenness, following the permitted sale and the consequent use of alcoholic beverages, is the parent cause of the vast mass of social woes, and that prohibition is the just and necessary agency through which to stay the ravages of drunkenness and cure the social evils to which it gives rise.

With great force of argument and wealth of illustration, Mr. Andrew undertook to show that reason, experience, and history, all unite to prove that drunkenness is not the parent or essential cause of social degredation, of poverty and other miseries, without which they would not have been, but is itself the mere concomitant or consequence of that degredation. Easy as it is to make drink the cause of crime, the real fact is that causes which make men drink operate also to make them criminals. Mr. Andrew quoted this declaration of the great German observer, Liebig: "In many places destitution and misery have been ascribed to the increasing use of spirits. This is an error. The use of spirits is not the cause, but an effect, of poverty. It is an exception from the rule when a well-fed man becomes a spirit drinker. On the other hand, when the laborer earns by his work less than is required to provide the amount of food which is indispensable in order to restore fully his working powers, an unyielding, inexorable law or necessity compels him to have recourse to spirits. He must work; but in consequence of insufficient food, a certain portion of his working power is daily wanting. Spirits, by their action on the nerves, enable him to make up the deficient power."

Degredation and Crime Due to Poverty and Misery.

Quoting an eminent English Inspector of Prisons to the effect that in periods of prosperity the prisons were comparatively empty, Mr. Andrew said of the prevalence of drunkenness, "the ignorant, neglected, poverty-stricken and forlorn, are also drunken." He cited also the declaration of a Secretary of the Board of State Charities

that "It is notorious that the great mass of criminals is made up of the poor, the ill-taught, the ill-conditioned, and, in a double sense, the unfortunate." The causes which make them criminals make more than two-thirds of them intemperate. The Secretary just quoted said again that "no less than three-fourths of what is technically called crime among us, is the **direct** result of poverty and its attendant evils....That degree of poverty which excludes education, which abases and finally destroys self-respect, which breeds disease, indolence, and vice, is conspicuous in every civilized country, and conspicuous as a curse. Of such did the wise man say, "The **destruction** of the poor is their poverty'."

The reason, said Mr. Andrew, why the humblest laboring class have not made as great an advance upward from immorality and drunkeness as the class above them, is simply because of the sufferings they undergo, the sense of wrong in their condition, and the sorrows which sweep over them, a great tide of depression, degradation, and distress, from which the stimulating cup is their easiest relief.

"I cannot," said Mr. Andrew, "but give honor to the social reformers, preaching the truths of nature and her science, for the relief of the suffering poor, and I give honor also to that very class of weary and depressed laborers, for their response. The degradation of circumstances has yielded already. Theirs never was a voluntary depravity which elected drunkenness for the mere love of gin, and accepted misery for the sake of the bowl. As social science advances, as society itself leads, so they will continue to follow. They may yet be brutish, yea, and drunken too; but **drunkenness will disappear as light shines in on the darkened intellect, as opportunity develops manhood, as hope visits and encourages the heart."**

All down the ages, and most of all in the generations nearest to the first preaching of Christianity to the masses of the Roman Empire, the rescue of great numbers from the lowest depths of moral degredation proceeded, as it has always proceeded, through the closest possible combination of helpful charity, food and drink, bread and wine and care of the sick, with humane, brotherly, and sisterly, moral appeal.

Alcoholic Beverages Not Less A Necessity than Tea and Coffee.

Respectable authority in physiology has commonly maintained, and still maintains, that alcoholic beverages taken in fit combinations, and in due moderation, perform the functions of food, and are a widely universal necessity of human diet, precisely the same as tea and coffee.

Speaking of tea and coffee, the great German chemist, Liebig, raised the question "whether it depended on sensual and sinful inclinations merely that every people of the globe has appropriated some such means of acting on the nervous life." Alcoholic beverages come under the question no differently from tea and coffee, use of which may be carried to an extrame of hurtful abuse, and in some cases, not a few, may do injury however limited the use.

Dr. Leila T. Whitehead, at a W. C. T. U. meeting in Chicago, declared that tea and coffee are worse for children than beer. "One of the greatest specialists in children's diseases," she said, "has told me he would rather give his children beer three times a day than give them tea or coffee." She scored the members of the W. C. T. U. for allowing their children to use tea and coffee while they were so severely condemning beer, which she really considered less harmful." The "Physical Culture" magazine, which gives Dr. Whitehead's declaration, very confidently urges the same condemnation of tea and coffee as stimulants of pronounced injury to health.

Liebig's Account of Alcohol as Food.

Liebig distinguished two classes of food, (1) non-nitrogenized substances, rich in carbon, and subject to oxidation directly and thereby producing animal heat; and (2) nitrogenized substances which go to form the blood and tissues of the body; and of the place of alcohol with the first class he said:

"Besides fat and those substances which contain carbon and the elements of water [hydrogen and oxygen], man consumes in the shape of the alcohol of fermented liquors another substance which, in his body, plays exactly the same part as the non-nitrogenized constituents of food."

"The alcohol, taken in the form of wine, or any other similar beverage, acquires the property of combining with oxygen to a far higher degree than is known to occur in the case of fat and other non-nitrogenized substances."

Exceptional Heating Value of Brandy.

It is from the fact thus stated by Liebig, that alcohol, uniting with oxygen in the body as no other food does, serves to produce animal heat as no other food does, that one of the greatest necessities of common experience arises, that of use of such an internally heating stimulant as brandy, or, somewhat less effectively, whiskey, to drive out chill upon any taking cold by exposure. Human health would gain incalculably if the use of brandy for prompt internal

heating, with other means to the same effect, but in a less degree and less promptly, were universally understood; and it is a flagrant crime of fanaticism which, by a law of total abstinence, bars out a resort to beneficial food more useful to man, more necessary for prevention of fatal illness, and more natural, than any other fact of human diet. Ignorance of this use of alcohol as a heating food is causing sickness and death, by pneumonia and consumption especially, to a degree not approached by the abuse of alcoholic stimulants, and harm done by total abstinence, barring out use of brandy or whiskey for the purpose named, plays to a fearful extent the part of disease and death.

Highly Beneficial Use of Stimulant Drinks.

But more to the general purpose of health and life are uses of the common stimulant drinks to prevent which is a chief object of prohibition. As to the use of wine, Liebig makes this perfectly just declaration:

"As a restorative, a means of refreshment when the powers of life are exhausted, of giving animation and energy where man has to struggle with days of sorrow, as a means of correction and compensation where misproportion occurs in nutrition, wine is surpassed by no product of nature or art.... In no part of Germany do the apothecaries' establishments bring so low a price as in the rich cities on the Rhine; for there wine is the universal medicine of the healthy as well as the sick. It is considered as milk for the aged."

Another eminent authority, Pereira, says in regard to beer:

"Considered dietetically, beer possesses a threefold property; it quenches thirst; it stimulates cheer; and, if taken in sufficient quantity it intoxicates.... Beer proves a refreshing and salubrious drink, if taken in moderation, and an agreeable and valuable stimulus and support to those who have to undergo much bodily fatigue."

In Chambers' Encyclopaedia, under "Diet," the writer says:

"The laboring man, who can hardly find bread and meat enough to preserve the balance between the formation and decay of his tissues, finds in alcohol an agent which, if taken in moderation, enables him, without disturbing his health, to dispense with a certain quantity of food, and yet keep up the weight and strength of his body."

Iniquitous Interference with Human Rights.

Against these facts prohibition cannot stand. It is a law of iniquitous interference with liberty, of suppression of rights which are on the same basis as the right to eat bread and to drink water.

"It used to be thought right," said Mr. Andrew in the close of his plea against prohibition, "to burn a man's body for the salvation of his soul. It used to be thought that to suppress heresy and false teachers deceiving the people, was mercy to the heretic and the false teachers themselves, while it protected the people against perversion and spiritual ruin. The motive was not bad but the philosophy was fatal. The better the motive, the sincerer the men, the more disastrous was the policy. So now, aiming at compulsory conformity to a creed of artificial virtue, those who dissent, regarding themselves merely as the victims of a dominant asceticism, are made deaf to moral teachings, impatient of the preacher, haters of his doctrine and defiant at heart.

"I maintain the positions I have assumed, and enforce them by arguments, because I believe these positions to be true, and the arguments sound. I charge back upon all those who, in the spirit of jesuitical philosophy would sacrifice the truth, science, and argument, to a supposed moral expediency, that they are unsettling the foundations of morality in the confidence of men.

"Do you suppose that the people of every class and persuasion, —taught by professors and practitioners of medical science of every school to take wines and beer as tonics, and restoratives, and as part of their diet, in illness, in age, or on occasions of physical depression, will believe that wines and beer are essentially and characteristically poisonous? The people are not blind to the inconsistencies and sophistries of those who claim to lead them.

"The proof is clear that none of the fatal exhibitions of intemperance, bad as they are, afford any ground for conformity enforced by prohibition.

"Bad as is the unguarded use of 'rebellious liquor,' it is safer—a hundred times safer—to bear with it, until it can be met by curing the inward disease of which drunkenness is a manifestation."

BOOK FOURTH.

Cardinal Gibbons Condemns Prohibition.

Cardinal Gibbons can be safely pronounced the fairest, broadest, and ablest living representative of Roman Catholicism. He is not outranked by any churchman of any faith anywhere in the world. The prayer which he offered in the 1876 celebration of the Declaration of American independence was an expression of patriotism and piety as perfect as devout thought and felicitous utterance could make it. In a matter of humanity, of justice and charity, such as this of making the best of the drink problem, no sage, scholar, statesman, or saint can speak to better purpose than Cardinal Gibbons. In a statement issued by him in Baltimore, he says:

"Local option should under no circumstances apply to this city. Liquor would be sold here quite as abundantly under prohibition laws as under well-regulated license. The consequence will be that liquor will be dispensed contrary to law instead of being sold in accordance with law.

When a law is flagrantly and habitually violated it brings legislation into contempt. It creates a spirit of deception and hypocrisy, and compels men to do insidiously and by stealth what they would otherwise do openly and aboveboard.

You cannot legislate men into the performance of good and righteous deeds. If we are to improve the morality of our city and make our citizens more temperate let the virtue of temperance be proclaimed in the churches; above all let it be enforced in the family, that parents, both by word and example, may inculcate their children with the temporal and spiritual blessings which spring from a life of temperance and sobriety.."

An ardent Irish supporter of the No-License fanaticism in Worcester inadvertently testified the wrong way in a meeting of the Reform Club, March 21st, 1908. He said:

"We spend for rum every year twice as much money as any other country. The reason is that there is twice as much money in the United States.

"It is the custom of drinking that is wrong in this country, more than in any other. In Ireland, when I was a boy, everybody

drank, man, woman and child. The child was pushed up to the table in a high chair, so he could get his drink with the rest. It made flesh and bones, and I got mine as well as the others. You never heard of a man dying a drunkard's death there.

"If six men go into a barroom in this country, together, they start with a whiskey and there are six rounds. Everybody has to buy or is insulted. If there happens to be a strong man in the crowd, he is all right, but the others go off like this. (He illustrated with an imitation of a drunken man).

"In the old country, every man would order his own, drink it and pay for it. The system is wrong here. I know the whole routine, from the top to the bottom."

At a meeting in the town of Oxford, April 5th, 1908, the day before the town voted for license (Yes 240, No 238), Dr. Alexander F. Chamberlain, of Clark College, Worcester, made an appeal for No-License, in the course of which he used bounce of this sort, in reckless disregard of truth:

"Will you, after the example set you by the city of Worcester, vote to legalize the sale of intoxicating liquors in this beautiful New England town, or will you uphold us who live in the city and have crushed out the evil for one year, at least, so that in time to come, with your support, we can drive this most evil and iniquitous business from the Commonwealth?"

The expectation of carrying the city of Worcester a second time for No-License no sane man could entertain if public law should provide for a reasonable reform under which sale of alcoholic beverages can be carried on the same as sale of meat, groceries, and drugs. As for driving the supply of these beverages out of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts it is on a par with Mrs. Eddy's proposal to make punishable as murder belief in the existence of disease and the possibility of death. Even with its evils the saloon is a permanent and profitable factor of human society, and if churches such as supply prohibition fanaticism in politics were at all faithful and efficient to supply organized aid and comfort to the mass of human toilers needing it, and of sufferers perishing for want of it, four-fifths of the evils due to resort of men to the saloons as their only resource would cease to exist; while the sole effect of denying the open saloon to those who now frequent it is to augment the tide of injury from liquor, and of misery, crime, and degredation, which sweeps through the lower levels of human society. The Prohibition priests and Levites, seeing the man who has fallen among robbers, throw him over the

wall into the ditch, as they would a dead dog, and congratulate themselves upon removing an offence to pious eyes.

"Prohibition Ineffective."

A press report in the Worcester Telegram of March 23d, 1908, under the head of "Prohibition Ineffective," said:

Since Worcester voted no-license there has been much discussion as to the wisdom of the verdict at the polls.

Many arguments are advanced in favor of no-license, that appeal to temperance people, but none of those who have spoken against no-license seem to have put up as good an argument as Rev. Dr. Cyrus Cort, a retired minister of the Reformed Church, now living in Baltimore. Dr. Cort is widely known in New England, and has many acquaintances in Worcester.

Dr. Cort says prohibition is unscriptural and ineffective, and that to indorse it would be to nullify and pervert many passages of the scriptures.

At the same time he declares prohibition contrary to the aim of free constitutional government.

Dr. Cort distinguished himself by his opposition to the prohibition movement in 1880, in the Pennsylvania campaign. His name had been used along with other ministers as a delegate-at-large to the Franklin County Prohibition Convention.

As this was done without his consent, or knowledge, he published a denial, saying he could not consistently indorse prohibition because it was unscriptural.

Sidney R. Durkee, formerly proprietor of the Bay State House, with D. C. Sargent, has a vivid memory of the aged minister, and in speaking of him, he said:

"I remember he was opposed to drunkenness, but never favored prohibition, and his views on the question have been confirmed by the history of prohibitory legislation and the inexorable logic of events.

"Dr. Cort claims that as a practical measure of temperance reform, prohibition has been largely a failure, and tends to create a community of spies, informers and hypocrites, the most abominable state of society that we can conceive.

"Dr. Cort's argument was taken up all over the country, and as he was the first minister to take such a stand in the campaign, he soon became the object of attack and misrepresentation. People began to write to him from all parts of the country, and he was soon convinced the so-called temperance advocates of the prohibition

persuasion are the most intemperate and unreasonable people in the world.

"Dr. Cort has not changed his views since that time and he regards prohibitory legislation for a large city as impossible and capable of harm in a community.

"Dr. Cort says in Maine, for instance, every saloon was out of business, and every drugstore was a saloon. Druggists made fortunes by selling liquor, and physicians made money writing prescriptions for it. As much was sold as ever, but the community derived no revenue from the sale.

"He declares that local option, which is really prohibition, is not possible in any community, unless the moral sense of all the people is back of it. Unless they, themselves, all of them, want it, the enforcement of such legislation is impossible.

"The low class of saloons, he contends, can be abolished if the existing laws are properly obeyed and enforced. Dr. Cort, like all good people, believes in temperance, but there is a difference of opinion in regard to the promoting of it.

"To confound prohibition with temperance in the genuine scriptural sense, is utterly absurd and misleading, says Dr. Cort. Wine and corn and oil were recognized as among the choicest gifts that God could bestow upon the children of men in response to their honest industry. All reliable commentators, Oriental scholars and travelers agree in declaring that such a thing as unfermented wine was unknown in Bible lands."

If it were a question of excess, of extreme dissipation, and of drunkenness, these evils were at their worst among the nobles and rich of Israel and Judah, but all the same the law of the passover as the Jews celebrated it in the time of Christ was that for emphasis of joy and rejoicing every man should have, in the course of the passover supper, four full cups of wine. It was a roast lamb supper, the best which Jewish experience knew, and it called for genuine wine and plenty of it.

Ignorant Appeal to Science.

In the name of "The Unitarian Temperance Society," Rev. Joseph H. Crooker publishes the following attempt to give counsel of knowledge and discretion in the matter of alcoholic beverages:

"At the root of much of the drink habit lies the popular belief that beer and whiskey both relieve exhaustion and increase strength. The man who drinks 'moderately' does for a time feel stronger, and

the weary laborer who drinks 'moderately' does for a time feel rested. But scientific investigations have clearly and decisively proved that these apparent helps are only **apparent**; for in a short time the drinker is worse off, both physically and mentally.

This real depletion and destruction of life even by **moderate** drinking has been well stated by a very eminent English doctor, George Carpenter of London, who has had an exceptionally large hospital practice.

After describing briefly the apparatus for measuring what is known as the **time-reaction** of the brain, that is, the time actually expended by the brain in performing mental acts and setting the machinery of the body in operation, Dr. Carpenter makes this important statement:

"Suppose, now, we give alcohol in quite small quantities to the person on whom we have been experimenting, what happens? In the first place, with the simple experiment, the time is shortened—the brain **appears** to operate more quickly than before, but after a few minutes a slowing takes place, becomes more marked, and endures as long as the alcohol remains in the system. But, if the reaction be complex, if there be an association of ideas, this is never quickened by alcohol. The slowing effect begins at once, and continues throughout the experiment. And clearly understand that this depressing effect occurs with the use of dietetic quantities of alcohol. When Kraepelin experimented upon himself, he was under the impression that alcohol quickened the complex reaction periods. Thus he was firmly convinced that he could add and substract figures much more quickly under its influence. But, when he came to consult the recording instrument, he was astonished to find that the mental operations which he thought he conducted so quickly and so well were, on the contrary, gone through much more slowly. Alcohol, therefore, **cheated** his intellectual judgment, but it could not deceive the recording instrument. Thus it happens that the man who has taken even small quantities of alcohol feels that his brain is remarkably active and capable of great thoughts, whereas in reality his conceptions are ever so much slower than natural. The feeling of well-being which follows the drinking of small doses of alcohol is an illusion. The subjective sensation of great muscular power is part and parcel of this feeling of well-being. Thus subjective sensations of the possession of great strength is not peculiar to alcohol, it is seen with other drugs such as chloroform and ether. In anaesthesia by these drugs the patient is under the impression that

he is making superhuman exertions, whereas they are very ordinary efforts indeed.

These supremely vital facts need to be forcibly impressed upon the minds, not only of young people, but of laborers. The workman must be made to see and feel that the saloon is not helping him as he imagines. The help from drink is not, as he thinks, real help at all: the exhileration is not only transcient but deceptive. The permanent result is loss, not gain. All men need this wisdom of sobriety confirmed by science. The people must be emancipated from the **superstition** that there is strength in the beer-mug and relief from exhaustion in a glass of whiskey. But along with this emancipating education must also go instruction in better ways of life and provisions by which laborers, especially, may secure relief and recreation that are really effective, because creating rather than destroying life."

The science experiment here is of no value whatever, in its apparent contradiction of intellectual judgment, and of a great mass of human experience. Its evidence cannot count against a valid experience of relief. The less rapid action of the nerves with a feeling of relief so decided as to seem increase of speed, is precisely what is wanted. There might be the same result of experiment in the case of food, but it would mean nothing against food. An eminent librarian, after forty years' experience, said the other day, "When I go home for dinner at noon after particularly exhausting work, I take a small glass of whiskey and have always found it give me back my vigor and tone." The experience of the present writer, upon occasional very slight resort to ale, light wine, brandy (in case of chill to be thrown off), or whiskey with lemon juice half and half and hot, a full large glass, mostly hot water (in case of a settled cold), has always proved satisfactory. The man who gets hold of some fragment of science, or some mere assertion, where he has had no experience, and lectures people to the effect that one's experience is delusive, is the idiot of his own ignorance.

Free Rum Under No-License.

Under the head of "Rum Free as Water" the Sunday Telegram of April 12th, had the following report from a no-license town:

"North Brookfield, April 11.—'Rum is handled in North Brookfield as freely as water and the places where it is sold are rotten dives, smoke and hellholes' declares Charles Parkman in a speech at the adjourned town meeting this afternoon.

Mr. Parkman tried to persuade the voters to appropriate $300

for the suppression of the illegal sale of rum, but his motion was voted down, 57 to 48. Mr. Parkman continued:—

'The proprietors of these places with all their friends came to the polls last Monday and voted no-license. They voted no because they wanted to continue to run these dives and sell intoxicating liquor for another year, and fatten their pocketbooks in the bargain.

'They knew if they voted no-license they could sell rum openly and not be molested by the town officials. This is proven here every day, for right here on our main streets, within a stone's throw of the church, rum is sold in all ways and manners. In most any part of the town rum is sold openly.

The vote on the motion was the most spirited during the meeting."

Very many years since, when Connecticut had voted a law requiring licenses to be fixed at a high figure, the present writer witnessed the town meeting vote of New Haven. It was taken on the green, at the south end of the old state house, by division of the voters on either side of a wide wwalk. On one side, voting for high license, were the representative university people and the best citizenship of the town, and on the other, voting for no-license, were the worst crowd of reprobate and repulsive human beings the writer has ever seen, and mingled among them a contingent of stern, severe fanatics of prohibition. It is only by this combination of decent politics with degraded that a vote for no-license can be carried, and from the moment that the vote is carried no adequate power exists to prevent a worse form of sale than that of regularly licensed saloons.

The Telegram (Worcester) of May 10th had reported of important opinions as follows:

"I have some misgivings about this no-license business being a success in Worcester," said Ellery B. Crane, secretary of the Worcester Society of Antiquity.

"Mind you, I'm a temperance man, and there is no one who would like to see the saloons banished more than I would, but here in such a cosmopolitan city as Worcester, it is a question of the less of two evils. My candid opinion is that license is the less. I fervently hope that Mayor Logan may see the consummation of that temperance dream of which he himself is a striking embodiment, but from a social point of view and from the plane of practical business, I shall probably differ.

"I had some experience in city politics once myself, and I re-

member this license question was once a very bothersome problem. I believe that a certain number of saloons which are licensed and properly regulated in a city as large as Worcester, will do more toward minimizing the liquor traffic than any plan of no-license of which I have any knowledge.

"Perhaps there might be a less number of saloons licensed and perhaps the restrictions might be drawn a little tighter, but I say, give us the open saloons in preference to the insidious infractions of the no-license law. When so many homes develop into kitchen barrooms, as they are bound to in a city made up like Worcester, and when women are dragged into the traffic and little children are trained to watch at the windows for the police officers, I say that the no-license plan is carrying the traffic where it has not been before, in the sanctity of the home, to the detriment of the women and the perversion of the children.

"I contend that so long as liquor is manufactured, people are going to drink. If they don't get it one way, they will another, and if they don't drink it in one form they will another. This, I think, is a point that is sometimes lost sight of.

"To my mind, there is but one key to the solution of the liquor traffic. That key is in the hands of the lawmakers in Washington. When they pass a law closing up every distillery and brewery in the land, then will come a reign of temperance such as the world has never seen before. Stop making liquor. Then the people will stop drinking."

The "Stop Making Liquor" key to the solution of the liquor problem is simply idiocy. Importation of drinks and emigration of drinkers would increase the drink bill with certainly no decrease in the number of drinkers. There is the same solution for the ale, beer, wine, whiskey, and brandy problem as for the coffee, tea, sugar, ice water, and other food problems. A press story of May 10th, 1908, said:

"English chemists say America is a nation of dyspeptics caused by the excessive use of sugar. German chemists say America is a nation thoroughly sick with catarrh from use of sugar. American chemists say America is a nation of consumption caused by the excessive feeding the young with sugar. French chemists say Americans clog their livers to dangerous extremes by the use of sugar. To sum it all up, sugar made from cane or beets is more dangerous than famine or war, and there are only two things as I can find which are more injurious than sugar. These are first of all, coffee, then tea."

That the drinking is not stopped by No-License became plain to even the fanatics wayfaring from their temples on the tenth day of the senseless, scandalous, shameless Worcester experiment. The Telegram (Worcester) reports of May 10th said:

"Worcester will not have a dry Sunday today, and the beer guzzlers who have the price and know where to go can wash down their talking tubes with plenty of ale, porter, or lager beer.

Friday and yesterday the stuff poured into the city, coming from all points of the compass, from nearby wet towns and more distant anti-thirst cities.

From Milford, Providence, Woonsocket and Nashua, N. H., to say nothing of Boston, the stuff arrived on the different trains during the day, in cases, kegs and casks.

Friday, 50 cases came in and yesterday a carload was dumped into the offices of the different express companies.

Four carloads were shipped in, yesterday. One was consigned as express for the express companies. The other three came as freight. Much of the freight was assigned to the express companies. And besides that every train and every trolley car that pulled into Worcester, carried people who carried one or more quarts.

Lieut. George H. Hill's liquor squad watched proceedings around at the express offices. They've got no unusual reports to make, they said, but are satisfied that lots of the beer taken by the companies went to stock blind tigers. They also admitted that for the first time since May 1 beer has come in in quantities. They date the traffic from last night, when four carloads were delivered about the city."

The record of daily receipts from elsewhere of liquors for consumption in Worcester rose rapidly. For June 10th it was "600 cases (24 bottles to a case), and 75 kegs of beer, 80 gallons of whiskey, and 30 gallons of wine." For June 17th it was "586 cases and 74 kegs of beer, 97 gallons of whiskey, 21 gallons of wine, by express companies, and the regular carload of beer from Providence by the New Haven freight, scattered all over Worcester." For July 4th the press report said:

"Yesterday's invoice of liquor received in Worcester by licensed express companies was the greatest of the season. About 2,000 cases of beer, 200 kegs of beer, and 150 gallons of whiskey found their way into the city up to 9 o'clock last night, and every train that arrived from Boston or Providence brought more.

The 48,000 bottles figure up to 6,000 gallons, and the 200 kegs

amounted to 2,000 gallons, in all about 8,000 gallons of beer. The whiskey came into the city in quart, two-quart and gallon packages.

The express companies were rushed to the last ditch. Every outfit that passed up Front street from Union Station was piled high with cases and kegs. Some companies were forced to run job wagons into service, and decorate them with temporary signs, to take care of their rush.

At 6 o'clock last night the lading platform of express companies at Union Station looked more like the lading platform of a brewery."

The exhibit in Front street due to the existence there of saloons was a special complaint of an eminent clergyman whose zeal for prohibition was notably conspicuous, yet it was nothing compared with the exhibit under No-License, and that not only in Front street, at the railroad station, and all over the city, but in vicinities outside of Worcester.

The Worcester Telegram of May 15th had the following:

"I realize that you people here in Worcester have a hard task before you to keep the no-license administration in power for any number of years, and possibly for even two years," said R. C. Reed, former candidate for Prohibition governor in Michigan, yesterday, "but I believe it is possible.

"There is no reason why a few people who want intemperance and debauchery should rule supreme over any city."

Good riddance of the, not "a few" unhappily, but the many "who want intemperance and debauchery," is to be fervently desired, and is desired by none more fervently than by the most strenuous opponents of prohibition. The vicinity of Worcester is having horrible experience of that class through the invasion in license towns of great numbers of the hard drinkers of the No-License city, and not only is the waste of money by these degraded wretches considerably increased, but the drinking is harder, the riot of indulgence and disorder worse, and the enforced contact of decent people with maudlin profanity, debauchery, and foulness greatly augmented and aggravated. An infamy of indifference to making matters worse is fastened upon Worcester by a No-License administration ruthlessly engaged in dumping its moral sewage into the trolley cars that it may proclaim its cesspools empty. Rev. Dr. Tomlinson, of the No-Hell-for-me church, proclaimed in a special Sunday address May 9th that he heard a young girl say that under No-License she was not afraid to go on the street in Worcester. The Bible lake of fire for all liars yawns directly under

the height over the precipice of which Dr. Tomlinson would go if he did not keep himself misinformed that the wild beasts of disgusting debauchery are not on the streets somewhere tenfold what they were before the 1st of May, and are not carrying defilement and danger into suburban street cars a hundredfold more than before May 1st.

Fanatical Denunciation of A Brewing Corporation.

A Worcester Brewing Company came under violent fanatical denunciation by a clergyman, Rev. F. A. Gould, on Sunday evening, March 1st, because of certain half-page advertisements through which, as manufacturers of beer, ale, and lager beer, the Company has protested the legitimacy of its business, the outrage of denial of freedom to make lawful and useful drinks, and the singular unwisdom and bad policy of prohibitive interference with freedom in the matter of drink.

Dr. Gould took for his text the passage, Titus 1, 10-11, "For there are many vain talkers and deceivers whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not for filthy lucre's sake."

In opening his remarks he said: "About the last things we associate in our thoughts are beer and literature. A Worcester brewing concern has a literary ad writer, and at frequent intervals since the no-license campaign, we have been given half-page advertisements in the daily papers of Worcester. They have artistic borders of barley and hops, with the hearts of the Commonwealth at the corners, also bearing the corporation monogram.

"I have not publicly noticed the advertisements until now. But they are so insinuating, so packed with sophistry, so full of anxiously expressed desire to lift up society and save the municipality and State from suicidal legislation against the liquor traffic, so calculated to allay antagonism to the drink traffic, so altruistic and so religious (?) that I have decided to speak."

Dr. Gould proceeded to an outpour of fanatical satire, scorn, and pious sophistry, designed to bring into contempt the author of sentences such as the following:

"Men of wisdom believe that prohibition is impractical, and do not approve of it.

"Morally, financially and politically the **open saloon,** under a proper form of license, is more beneficial to Christian civilization than is prohibition.

"This corporation sincerely believes the above.

"It should be evident to any one familiar with the tastes, traits and desires of men, that some remedy, other than prohibition, must be adopted before the vice of intemperance can be suppressed.

"Prohibition is not an ally of economy, moral law, total abstinence or temperance.

"License, governed by regulation and inspection, is an ally of economy, total abstinence, temperance and moral law.

"Prohibition creates conditions favorable to the production of greater manhood-destroying evils than intemperance.

"Prohibition creates conditions favorable to the presence of the cheapest, vilest and most injurious compounds known to the unscrupulous chemist.

"When sincere, honest advocates of No-License realize the necessity of the saloon they will change their political views and meet the issue from a human, practical standpoint.

"The minister who advocates prohibition, and depends upon that to elevate the character and conscience of man, leaves to civil laws to accomplish that which must be accomplished by kindly personal contact.

"The successful apostle of temperance is he who draws men away from the desire for liquor.

"It is not he who draws liquor away from the desire of men."

Shameless Falsification in Support of Prohibition.

Dr. Gould had reason to believe that these sentences would carry the appearance of pure motive and honest conviction, and the violent denunciation with which he replied to them was hot with shameless falsification as the only means of even seeming to make an effectual argument against the unanswerable condemnation of prohibition. The assumption that there is only an evil use of stimulant drinks, and that manufacturers consciously promote the evil use, and cannot honestly pretend otherwise, hangs by one of the most monstrous lies ever conceived. Urgent and peremptory as the reasons are for strict temperance and even for abstinence, stimulant drinks yet remain of beneficial use in more than sixty per cent. of present actual cases, and would so remain in seventy-five to ninety per cent., if the line of sure benefit against possible evil could be actually drawn; and the inteligent manufacturer of such drinks and the merchant supplying them in trade, comprehend the extreme importance to them to have those who drink understand themselves, and as carefully as possible avoid all chance of evil.

Teetotal Diet Not Conducive to Sound Health and Long Life.

Beyond a question the diet which excludes the use of stimulant drinks, under no matter what circumstances, does not answer as well for sound health and long life as the diet which calls in the aid, more or less, of ale, wine, whiskey, brandy, upon intelligent apprehension of beneficial use of something of the kind. In a general way an immense class of people are very greatly benefitted by the being made sleepy through a trifle of alcohol on their nerves, while the engine driver for a railway train, speeding at the best in the face of perils, could not safely risk being made sleepy. In all probability railway and other corporations insisting that their men shall not come to their tasks under any effect whatever of stimulant drink, will learn that the men who must be so restricted particularly need after work something like Queen Victoria's ration of whiskey, to enable them to recover after exhaustion of strength.

Exhaustion May Disable the Engineer Even Worse Than Liquor.

The exhaustion of nervous energy which causes the engineer to lose for a moment consciousness of the throttle under his hand, while he goes thundering past a signal to disastrous wreck, is quite as serious as any effect of liquor; and upon clear physiological grounds we may fairly doubt whether the men who have had a reasonable drink are not safer than those denied that aid to endurance under extreme mental strain. Nearly all the prohibition of drink insisted on by business interests could undoubtedly be reversed if with clearer knowledge and better judgment the lines were exactly drawn between use which is doubtful or perhaps dangerous and that which is surely beneficial. A business concern requiring day-time abstinence of its men could not possibly do a better thing than provide a commodious club room for evening resort, with bread and cheese and a glass of good drink for every man,—alcoholic drink in most decided preference to coffee or tea (the proper place for which is before or during work).

How Prohibition Makes Matters Worse.

Dr. Gould's facility in getting horsed on a falsfication is shown by his saying:

"If prohibition in regard to liquor caused worse conditions and greater desire for drink, why did the same not apply to all of God's commandments?

"Do his commandments forbidding murder, theft, adultery, falsehood, profanity, covetousness, awaken a desire for these things?

"If the brewing concern is right, God made the monumental blunder of history at Sinai."

Possibly Dr. Gould's brains are so addled with piety, that he merely fails to see the point, which is that if a prohibition interferes with a manifest right, it will be resented. God at Sinai give no encouragement to such insane folly, iniquity, and outrage as prohibition of use of perfectly proper articles of diet. In the Jewish celebration of the passover it was required that every participant should have **four** full cups of wine "which maketh glad the heart of man," and in the early celebration of the Christian supper, which was a matter of charity, not of ceremonial solemnity, the people brought loaves of bread and flasks of wine, to be given, or sent, after giving thanks, to those who were in need,—the wine as much as the bread for meeting the every day need of food.

The English Drink Tradition.

In the story of the coming of the Pilgrim Fathers to the planting of New England, there are several references which show that it was a notable change when for drink they no longer had English ale and were compelled to use water instead. The tradition of English drink from the earliest days has never been that of water, and although the progress of temperance during a generation or more has been very great, it only signifies repression of abuse, while use has become not only wiser but more general. A recent press report says of England's National income:

"The 50th or 'jubilee' report of the commissioners of inland revenue in England, recently issued, shows that the income of the nation from all sources under the jurisdiction of the commissioners amounted for the year ending March 31 last to the immense sum of $485,728,085, which is a little over $10,000,000 more than the revenue was in 1905-1906. The inland revenue of England brings in now nearly $100,000,000 a year more than ten years ago. The excise duties yielded an income of over $178,565,000, the stamp duties yielded over $93,815,000, and the income tax brought in nearly $160,000,000. Despite the assertions which are often made to the contrary, beer is becoming more and more the national drink. Duty was paid on no less than 34,363,313 barrels of beer."

Ministers By Theological Seminary Education Grossly Incompetent for Humane Service.

Dr. Gould comments sneeringly on the comparison between beer manufacturers and ministers in temperance interests and effort. Thus he says:

"Men who spend their lives making beer are supposed to know how to save a man from himself, but a man who spends his life to make and build up manhood is supposed to know nothing about it.

"Instead of going to a theological seminary and spending a lifetime studying first hand men and sin, go to the inner prayer meeting of a brewing concern where the advertisements were conceived. They know the successful apostle."

But it is perfectly true that above all others intelligent traders in liquor want the evils of use of liquor abated to the utmost, that the immense and increasing beneficial use may give them trade relations of perfectly unexceptionable character. On the contrary there are no ministers of any school, creed, or church, who spend their lives to make and build up manhood. They, one and all, get "sin" on the brain,—a notion derived from Babylonian theology, borrowed of Jewish theism, and brought into Christian tradition by Paul's system of Messianic Judaism, which has passed, to the present time, under the name of Christ, without the slightest warrant from his teaching. A theological seminary, characterized quite recently as "A school of organized ignorance," entirely misses the mark of Christ and his truth, in respect of making simple manhood the basis of communion and the bond of fellowship. Dr. Gould fishes for souls willing to get a sense of "sin" in their natures, when for this there is no such reason as is assumed, and willing, on the basis of this, to come out from the common human fold into some separate church, under pretension and profession of religion, in a sense very remote from the teaching of Christ.

Beneficial Possibilities of the Saloon.

It seems legitimate sarcasm to Dr. Gould to say:

"But for the brewers we would never have known that the saloon under a proper form of license is beneficial to Christian civilization and has a moral value."

There is, unhappily, no doubt of the ignorance which disables the prohibition fanatics from seeing that any good can come out of the saloons. That, however, does not alter the fact that saloons can be made less and less what they have too commonly been, and more and more what social conditions demand, at least until churches get down to the business of breaking bread and pouring the social cup with the unchurched mass of the common people.

Saloon Costs and Saloon Value.

Dr. Gould undertook to suggest, in an address to the Worcester

Reform Club, Sunday evening, March 15th, how to make the whole country dry of stimulant drink, a water Sahara with but a memory of saloons and of liquor. The Telegram of the next day had the following report:

"Rev. Dr. Frederic A. Gould, pastor of Grace church, got a strangle hold on the demon rum at the public meeting of Worcester Reform Club, last night, at the Club hall, 271 Main street. Dr. Gould tackled the rum traffic with figures and showed that the United States pays yearly for distilled liquors, wine and malt liquors, enough to pay off the municipal, county, state and national debts in two years; spends $57,000,000 more than the worth of the country's exports, $80,000,000 more than the value of imports, and $282,000,000 more than all the mineral products of the United States.

"He said the nation spends four and a half times more for drink than all the colleges and universities of the United States are worth, buildings, endowments, and all.

"The drink bill of the United States is $960,000,000 a year, that is a conservative estimate. Figured on the basis of glasses of liquor drunk the American people consumed last year 6,090,000,000 glasses of whiskey, paying $609,000,000 for the same, and 12,785,169,000 glasses of beer, costing $617,258,460.

"The American people consumed in 1894, 127,000,093 gallons of distilled liquors, whiskey, brandy and gin; 39,485,123 gallons wine, 1,699,985,642 gallons malt; total 1,874,225,409 gallons liquor, worth at wholesale about $1,000,000,000.

"Our drink bill is about five and one-half times as much as we spend for education in public schools, $170,639,081.

"It costs more than to run the United States government, the public schools, all the colleges, universities and academies, all the churches and all the missionary societies together.

"But there is another cost. Newell Dwight Mills of Chicago says: 'The economic loss through the non-productivity of 20,000 drunkards is equal to one Chicago fire, involving $200,000,000.' "

Of all preposterous economic assertions, that of the loss which the state incurs by withdrawal from productive activity of persons who become victims of some disease, disaster, or bad habit, is perhaps the worst. The lives of such persons in average health and activity cost upon the average more than they come to, and the state gains rather than loses if they drop out. But this apart, and even if the assertion is true, it proves nothing for prohibition. On the same ground exactly, that a very great number of people indulge to excess in customary food, we might attempt to abate a great evil

by prohibition of all meat diet, and the more as the killing of animals for food is incidentally of enormous practice of cruelty and degredation of those engaged in it. The howling dervish of vegetarianism can make quite as good a case as the fanatic of anti-rum, and it is beyond doubt that temperance in food is even more needed than temperance in drink.

Dr. Gould's economic trumpet gives a tremendous sound, most impressive in appearance, but not more senseless than it is ineffective. The figures he gives prove too much. Such a vast investment in "stimulant food" means that mankind at large depend on it precisely as they do on bread and meat, tea and coffee, milk and butter and eggs. Temperance might greatly reduce the cost per person for those who consume so much liquor, and yet perfect intelligence of what stimulant drink means might so extend its use to those who now abstain as to leave the aggregate, even with temperance in full sway, about what it now is. The undoubted progress of mankind in this matter is in temperate use in place of abuse by excess, and large extension of such use under clear knowledge of the value of stimulant drink to health and life.

Proposed Substitute for the Saloon.

At various times in the meetings of the Worcester Reform Club the problem of how to do without the saloons in such a city center of population has been referred to. A former president of the club said on one occasion:

"The Reform Club should this year provide or assist in providing a place for men who are now using the saloon as a club room It is a crying necessity for young and old men to have a place to pass their evenings. Something must be done to give these men a place to go. There are thousands of men who have nothing other than their room, the saloon and the playhouse after their daily work is done."

The Reform Club proposal of a room to give about a hundredth part of what the saloons have given is too much on the narrow, insufficient scale of church ministry to the masses. Normal human appetite, with such supper as a man commonly gets at home, naturally and inevitably craves something for evening sustenance, and the ideal provision for such evening comfort is a glass of ale, or its equivalent, with bread and cold meat, or rye bread and cheese. The English nine o'clock supper is one of the sanest traditions of civilization, and a city like Worcester shoul have a score of larger and a hundred of smaller saloons administered in view of this need.

The Great Problem.

At one of the meetings of the Worcester Reform Club a former president said:

"The National Association of liquor men has arranged for big display advertising in all papers that will take such advertising, exploiting the alleged benefits of the saloons to the people at large.

He said the liquor men will endeavor to show in this immense amount of advertising throughout the country that the saloons are a benefit, instead of a curse, and that the chief weapon they will wield is the alleged non-enforcement of the law."

That defects of the system under which license has been administered are the real evil, and that both parties might come together on a basis of administered law which would promote temperance more than any form of prohibition can, no competent judge of all the facts can deny. The existing system of high license and of state and municipal revenue from a trade entitled to stand where the trade in drugs, or the trade in flour, tea, coffee, and kindred food materials, stands, works immense mischief for all the interests concerned. It puts a premium upon vicious violation of the conditions of the license; it bars out honest and competent small dealers independently operating; and it specially taxes a legitimate business in a way to make its profits depend very largely upon employment of methods which are of evil effect. There is but one course of wisdom and justice in the matter, and that is licenses granted, not upon a substantial share in the profits of the business, but upon security that holders of licenses will honestly and faithfully keep the business upon a basis of respect for temperance, consideration of social interests, co-operation with agencies of charity and reform, and strict regard to the quality of the liquors supplied.

BOOK FIFTH.

Failure of Churches to Attempt Real Temperance Reformation.

If then we undertake to deal the best we can with unquestionably injurious excess, involving lamentable harm to great numbers through alcoholic disturbances of physical well being, and a plague of drunkenness and all that drunkenness means as a social curse, we still have no adequate resource in the spread of prohibition through schemes of law which do not destroy the springs but only divert the streams of liquor supply. In the last resort, after regulation of sale made as judicious and effective as possible, we have to reach results of value by the influences which are effective for making men abstinent on grounds of conviction; and the infamy of the situation today is that such influences, due to have large place and wide sway through churches administering good will to men, after the method and in the spirit of Christ, are not even an experiment in the name of religion anywhere. The comprehensive moral, social, and humane disaster of the whole world today, and through all history since Christ went about doing good, until Jewish pietism set upon him to kill him, is, that religion is now, and for all the ages has ever been, neither moral, nor social, no humane; it has not followed Christ to do good to men in common life, but has followed the pietism of Jewish temple worship and the Pharasaic separatism of the Jewish snyagogue from the common humanity, to pursue aims of selfishness under impulses of superstition,—aims and impulses which enlightenment has thoroughly discredited, while yet sect and creed and custom maintain them in form, however faint and futile their outward force.

Immense Human Interests Sacrificed to Sabbath-Worship.

To a peculiarly Christless purpose,—selfish, senseless, and superstitious,—the sects pretending to stand apart and above common humanity as "Christian," have pursued a relentless Judaism of Sabbath-worship, in the matter of opportunities for benefit to the common mass of mankind, which the great expositions of the age have afforded. At Chicago, for example, it would have been to the most Christian purpose if all the churches of the whole region had suspended usual services, and had devoted the Sundays of the whole season to personally conducted parties to the White City

WILDE'S BIBLE PICTURES. 112. H. HOFMANN. 1824—

CHRIST AND THE YOUNG RULER.

of the unchurched masses about them, until not a person of the hundreds of thousands shut out by their weekday toil, or their narrow means and scant comforts, had failed of free admission, decently clad and comfortably provided, to those vast aisles of material splendor whereof the glory was fitter for high Sunday effect than anything temple or tabernacle, cathedral or church or conventicle, ever saw. From a universal concerted scheme of self-denial of pietism, and practise of going about to do good, such as the Fair challenged the churches to undertake, there would have been an uplift of civilization by delightful instruction, by mitigation of bitterness far and wide among the troubled and turbulent dreamers or zealots of anarchy, and by unaccustomed comfort of human brotherhood reaching into the homes of the poor, worth more than all that the same churches ever before had accomplished, or have since accomplished.

Sabbath Superstition Borrowed by the Jews from Babylonian Custom: A Scheme of Mercenary Priestcraft.

Be a special use of Sunday what it may, the Sabbath never was in strict historic fact anything but a superstition found in Babylonia by the Jews at a late period in their history, that of the Exile period, and foisted upon Jewish custom at an even much later date by Nehemiah, a servitor of the Persian king at Babylon, who used persecuting violence as governor of Judea to compel the acceptance by the Jews of law and custom hitherto unknown to them. Nehemiah's action was part of the scheme of priests of the Jerusalem Temple to establish a system of slavish worship at their shrine, under their representations that the deity of that shrine, Yahwe, an Edomite god of thunder and the tempest, was their tribal god, and that he commanded them, one and all, far and near, to know him only, and to offer no worship save worship of him at Jerusalem. The custom of the land was of many gods at various local shrines, with freedom to all to offer anywhere whatever worship fear, or hope of favor, might suggest. This meant a presentation of offerings at the many country shrines, as well as at Jerusalem, and what the Yahwe priests undertook was to stop all this and turn the stream of offerings from all quarters into their own Temple. They wanted all the shekels of silver, and all the sheep, all the gold and all the good things of vineyard, pasture, or field, brought by the people in suit for supernatural favor, to be brought to them.

Priestcraft Uses Literary Fraud.

To effect their purpose the Yahwe Temple priests resorted to

manifest literary fraud. They fitted out, in what we know as the Book of Deutoronomy, what they announced as laws and statutes, given centuries before by Yahwe himself, to make the Hebrew tribes a nation unto himself, having no other god but him, offering no worship anywhere save at his Jerusalem Temple, and making offerings, silver and gold and products of every kind, to no other priests except the custodians of his worship and his wealth. These priests were the original Hebrew monotheists. That there were gods as many as the places of importance in the land, the Hebrews had understood for hundreds of years, with corresponding freedom of practise, and priests had thought no differently from the mass of the people; nor did the Temple of Yahwe priests so much instil a new thought as insist on a new custom, toleration of but one worship at one Temple.

"Den of Thieves" Enforces "Mosaic" Monotheism by Massacre.

By massacre through the land priests at other shrines were disposed of, and monotheism suggested to the country people everywhere. In the early days of this dawn of monotheism in Judea, the great politician-prophet whom we know as Jeremiah, blurted out the scorn of his honest humanity in the declaration that the Yahwe temple was a "Den of Thieves" and that the pretense of laws and statutes in their book given by Yahwe himself was a rascal fraud, as indeed it was. Temple and Scripture alike came of priestcraft no more conscious of God in any high sense and no more bent upon good than any ordinary Jew scheme of unscrupulous getting gain. The facts are perfectly plain on the Hebrew record, even if Jeremiah had not spoken and Jesus himself had not repeated the terrible indictment.

Jeremiah represented the Divine Voice as saying:

"Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The Temple of Yahwe, The Temple of Yahwe, The Temple of Yahwe.

"Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods, and come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my name? Is this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes?

"How do ye say, We are wise and the Law of Yahwe is with us? But, behold, the false pen of the Scribes hath wrought falsely."

It might be conclusively urged, in view of Jeremiah's sharp thrust at "the false pen of the Scribes" that Scripture as well as Sabbath was an idea of the Temple priests, who had in Jeremiah's

time produced, as "found in the Temple," the book which started a Bible of the Hebrews, and the substance of which we have in the book of Deuteronomy. When Nehemiah put through a campaign of violent enforcement of the demands of the Temple priests, he made the two things, Scripture and Sabbath, one interest. Both were suggestions from Babylonian religion, and both were forced upon the Jews at Jerusalem, after the Babylonian captivity, by Nehemiah, a violent zealot who came from Babylon expressly to fit these features of Babylonian religion into the religion of the Jews.

A Modern Jew Denounces the Sabbath Superstition.

The New York Sun of November 30th last (1907), published a letter in which Dr. Isidor Singer exhorted the Jews of America to start "a new epoch in our history and that of the world by shelving our ancient Shemitic superstitions once and for all." In these words Dr. Singer refers to points of Jewish orthodoxy which go back to Nehemiah and the Yahwe Priests of the Temple of Jerusalem, the Sabbath and the Kosher diet. Dr. Singer proceeded to say:

"Our rabbis, from the most radical to the most conservative, know, and we educated Jewish laymen at the end of the first decade of the twentieth century should know, that the Sabbath, an institution far older than the Decalog itself, had originally nothing to do with rest from labor, an overexertion being unthinkable in those primitive times when industry and commerce were yet in their infant stage. The Hebrew **sabbathon,** like the Babylonian **sabbatum,** was a **dies nefastus,** an unlucky day, like the Fridays and thirteenth of our modern superstition, and the prohibition of any activity on the seventh day had as little to do with genuine religion as the non-sailing of many of our war-vessels on Fridays or the omission of the room number 13 in several of our most progressive hotels.

"But in spite of this knowledge of its origin, the synagog as such has not the courage to divest the institution of the Sabbath of the religious, utilitarian, and hygienic interpretation imposed upon it by our ancient rabbis, ignorant of the very rudiments of a scientific study of religion, and by that pious industrial beehive, the England of the Puritans."

A "prehistoric superstition" Dr. Singer calls the Sabbath, and he declares that "the food forbidden by the Pentateuch" was so forbidden "for superstitious reasons, whose true character now lies open to the mind of the impartial student of religion."

"Nevertheless," Dr. Singer goes on to say; "most of our rabbis and teachers and educated laymen have to plead guilty to much

cowardice and cruelty in not opening the eyes of the 7,000,000 benighted Jews in Eastern Europe and the 1,500,000 in our own country who are bitterly handicapped in their economical progress by this strict adhersion to the dietary and Sabbath laws. The United Hebrew Charities and the body corresponding to it in England, the Jewish Board of Guardians, have for the last ten years or so openly declared the bankruptcy of Jewish charity, threatening from time to time to close their doors, but our philanthropists have not the courage to go to **the root of the evil: Sabbathon and Kashrut.** Close your pseudo-kosher butcheries and restaurants, tell the poor Russian, Galician, and Rumanian Jew that he has not only the right but the duty to work on Sabbath and the Jewish festivals, and you will then be in a position to close the Hebrew charities, sending your alms directly to the various boards of general charity for poor and sick and helpless human beings, not for the Jewish or Hebrew pauper."

The Genesis Story of a Six Days Creation a Deliberate Fiction.

In his "Creation Story of Genesis I.—A Sumerian Thegony and Cosmogony," Dr. Hugo Radau shows very clearly how, at a very late period, a Priest-scribe living in Babylonia became familiar with the oldest Babylonian ideas and used them to prepare the story of creation with which Genesis begins, but made some changes for the special purpose of adapting the Babylonian sabbath to use among the Jews. In particular he invented the account of God having made the parts of the creation by days work got through so as to rest on the seventh day. He did this, says Dr. Radau, "in order to establish for his Sabbath—and thus for all his laws and ordinances connected with the Sabbath—the greatest possible age.... The creation of the world is described as having taken place within a space of seven days. This system of seven days is not in the original story; it is not found in the Babylonian account. It was inserted by the Priestly writer."

By such deliberate literary fraud Priest-craft put a yoke of Sabbath observance on the necks of the Jews, and the tradition of that observance passed to Christians guided by the laws and ordinances which Priest-writers framed for their own selfish ends.

Denial of a Free Sunday More Baneful than the Saloon.

If the use to which the Sabbath has been put, by scribes,

Pharisees, and hypocrites* of recent times could be properly weighed, it may be doubted whether the superstition set up against free use of Sunday for the amelioration of the depressed condition of the toiling masses of mankind has not done harm at least equal to that which the saloon has done.

A False Religion Pretends "Sin" Requiring "Atonement."

It was superstition pure and simple, making the seventh day an unlucky, and in fact a prohibited one, for activity of any kind, including that of worship, which created the Sabbath as the Jews found it in Babylonia; and the Priests adopted it into their system, partly as a notable feature in their hands, and partly through the chance it gave to exact offerings at their shrine in atonement for breaches of sabbath law and ordinance. A chief aim and function of Priestcraft is that of having sin to deal with, atonement to prescribe and require, and absolution upon atonement by offerings to administer. Babylonian heathenism had especially wrought upon the minds of men for a sense of sin, wholly based upon ignorance, credulity, and imagination, and the Priestcraft of the "Den of Thieves" at Jerusalem worked the direful invention to the utmost.

The Puritan Holy Sabbath Wholly Jewish.

The Puritan zeal for a Holy Sabbath found its justification in the crude, ignorant, and slavish use of just those words of Hebrew scripture which Priestly fraud had put into the ancient record for this very purpose. Wholly failing to note how the teaching and action of Jesus had completely changed the Sabbath situation, to permit any service of man to put aside Sabbath observance, the strenuous rabbis of Calvinistic orthodoxy carried rigor of requirement, and zeal for the letter of 'Mosaic' law and ordinance, to an extreme of Sabbatarian fanaticism, under the dominance of which no generous use of Sunday for giving comfort, uplift, and moral impulse to the neglected masses, was any way possible.

In precisely the same fashion of dogmatic insistence, crafty special pleading, and moral terrorism, employed to promote prohibition, the Sabbath zealots have wrought to coerce legislators and at all costs carry their relentless fanaticism to victory, no matter what the loss, injury, and disaster to human interests out in the world. For these zealots of superstition, hot with the spleen of narrow Judaism, which said of Jesus "We know that God spake

---

*"Hypocrites" in this connection means Formalists, observers of forms, customs, traditions.

unto Moses, but as for this fellow we know not whence he is," there has been no thought of "the sabbath made for man, not man for the sabbath;" no sense of varied service of suffering humanity irrespective of sabbath observance, no disuse of custom and ritual to frame an order of ministration adequate to human needs beyond the limits of familiar church and communion.

The Teachings of Jesus Utterly Disregarded.

The Boston Transcript of February 19th, 1908, had a report of a Wednesday noon King's Chapel address, the headlines to which were: "An Unjust Social Order: Rev. Gustavus Tuckerman Declares Jesus' Teachings Utterly Disregarded." The report went on to say:

"Rev. Gustavus Tuckerman conducted the mid-week service in King's Chapel at noon today and in a brief address he declared that the teachings of Jesus seem to be utterly disregarded in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at least in so far as they affect the poor, the unemployed, and the suffering. The preacher read many passages from the Scriptures which show Christ's attitude and in which he rated humanity above everything else. There was an unjust social order in those days and there still remain conditions, he declared, that beget indifference and contempt on one hand with envy and hatred on the other."

It was not so much a social order separating the classes of the Jewish community as it was religious order which made distinctions of caste, putting a gulf of separation between Jew and Samaritan, Jew and Greek, Pharisees and the common people, orthodox and heretic, the church communicants and the unchurched, devotees of tradition and the unwashed multitude: a spirit in which the Pharisees pronounced the unlearned common people accursed because they knew not the law, and which said of Jesus "We know that God spake unto Moses but as for this fellow we know not whence he is."

Jesus went freely among those whom the Pharisees carefully avoided coming in contact with; he paid no attention to the idle scruples about clean and unclean (ceremonially); he made a Samaritan alien and heretic a type of ideal conduct, as contrasted with the priest and the Levite; he put aside the intense Sabbath superstition, and the hardly less intense Bible superstition and Temple worship superstition, which made the Jew antipathetic, separatist, and morose toward the cultivated Greek; and in every possible way he was simply a man among men, going about to do good.

Churches Based on Separatism from Humanity.

The common Protestant church follows the synagogue, the Pharisees, the whole Jew system of separatism on the basis of superstitions cast out by Christ but brought into the later Christian developments by Paul, who claimed authority to announce a "Gospel" of Messianic Judaism which compels the scholar of our day to say: "Christianity as we know it is Pauline Christianity."

This was a scheme of Theology, Christology, and Eschatology, requiring a particular idea of God as a deity of anger with all except certain believers; and of Jesus of Nazareth as a Son of God and the Messiah of the Jews; and of the end of the world in a supernatural coming down from heaven of the Messiah, he having not only risen from the dead after crucifixion but gone up to the heaven which Paul's Judaism located in the sky a short distance above the earth.

These ideas of Paul have required that a person should become one of the believers, and separate himself from the mass of mankind, in order to have any part and lot in a church, the custom of which is to give particular attention and care to its members, and not go particularly, in the sense of fellowship and communion, among the unchurched mass.

And instead of breaking bread, in the manner of Jesus, as a matter of human brotherhood, in the homes of the people, and without regard to such ideas as Paul insisted on, the churches have one and all made breaking bread and taking wine for communion a solemn church formality, exclusively particupated in by those members only out of a congregation who have become elect professors by formalities separating them from the mass of the congregation, as well as from the mass of a community. The result of all this has been, and still is, failure of congregations, as well as churches in the special sense, to know the unchurched as fellow members in life, and to extend fellowship aid and comfort wherever it is needed.

Comprehensive Failure of Churches to Minister to Human Need.

One comprehensive failure of the leading Protestant churches of Worcester, not to say of all our cities, inevitably bears fruit, in the winter season, of distress, disease, and deaths in great number, the scandal of which cannot be exaggerated. If these churches had the spirit and method of Christ, to go about doing good, there would be begun early in the autumn a campaign of thorough and efficient inquiry, in regard to the very large class of families the

children of which are certain to go to school, and the fathers perhaps to their labor, when the cold of late autumn or of early winter comes, without clothing adequate to prevent their taking cold.

One of the worst scandals in the history of science is public health protection managed under the microbe theory of disease-causation, when the fact is that, microbes or no microbes, grip, diphtheria, scarlet fever, and pneumonia, are invariably due to taking cold, and prevention of these complaints requires an early and efficient campaign of inquiry and generous help to make sure that exposure to the autumn chills and the winter cold does not find great numbers of children, and many laboring men, clad in the scanty garments of poverty and of the incompetence to watch out against trouble which poverty and social depression bring.

It would be an immense gain if the churches of culture and wealth shut down on pulpit work from November to April, and gave exclusive attention to practical work for the great mass of people subject to the peculiar distresses of the season. Their equipment of costly houses of worship, which are far too much club houses of selfishness and superstition, in the manner of the Jewish Temple, which Christ branded as a "Den of Thieves," is most unfortunate, especially for bodies of people against whose character no complaint can be brought, and whose conduct comes wofully short only because they are no better taught.

Brotherhood Houses Needed Far More than Church Buildings.

If 6, 12 or 24 churches would unite to provide at least half a dozen Brotherhood Houses on the plan of large first floor halls for brotherhood suppers, musical, lecture, and dramatic entertainments, with high basements for saloons, reading rooms, offices, &c., second stories for domestic comfort for women and children, a refuge for the homeless especially, and third stories for hospital service. it would mean a thousand times more than we have now of Christ and his Truth brought home to the unchurched mass of the population.

From Thanksgiving to the end of March I have looked anxiously to see some indication, by pulpit utterance or by church action, signifying adequate consciousness of, and conscience towards, the needs of the masses as the season must bring them, and in not a single instance have I found the least sign of such consciousness and conscience. "The Ladies Benevolent Society of Plymouth church provides the usual monthly supper, attended by 250 people

of the parish," is the report in one instance of what is going on in all the conspicuous churches.

Thanksgiving ought to mean gratitude undertaking the season's supply of aid and comfort for those that are in need. It is made to mean, not even some formal expression of gratitude to God, but having a time of domestic feasting, and incidentally one good dinner as an ostentation of charity to people great numbers of whom will suffer and perish under the cold of winter for lack of clothing, of access to shelter under circumstances of extreme distress, and of want of hospital service easily reached. Six Brotherhood Shelters of the kind mentioned above, their halls each of capicity for 1200, would do business against the saloons immensely beyond anything which No-license can accomplish, and the plague of sickness which is upon us as winter advances, would be, at least in large part, prevented.

The time has come to make the material comfort of mankind the first consideration, and to make devotion to our fellows in every matter of need the chief and most true devotion. On this basis, and this only, can a culture of great masses proceed, and until the provision of homes is far beyond what it can at present be the saloon with stimulant food wisely served will have a very important place.

BOOK SIXTH.

Temperance Universally Practicable.

Budweiser, claiming to be "The King of All Bottled Beers," "a right lusty beer, brewed conscientiously for over fifty years from barley and hops only—a right royal beverage for the home,"—uses the following statement for suggestion of example of great authority:

George Washington is justly held to be the purest figure in history—a superb example of the perfect citizen—a just and righteous ruler and "a light for after time."

His biographers declare that in eating and in drinking as in all things he was normal; enjoying the juice of the malt all the days of his life. He drank it around campfires, as well as in his own home and upon social and state occasions.

Furthermore, upon his Mount Vernon plantation he had a brew house, as was the regular custom of wealthy Virginians.

Of the veracity of this statement and the incontestible validity of its suggestion of authoritative example, there cannot be the slightest question. The tradition of Beer, German, English, and American, runs exactly parellel, and at the same high level, with the least questioned traditions of usage in production and custom in consumption of food products. The zealots of prohibition most absurdly and falsely assume that there is no such thing in the long run as temperance in the use of stimulant drinks, and not less falsely they assume that of all stimulant drinks only the alcoholic are productive of intemperance of grievously injurious character. There is no fact of the condition of the human race, in the nations of culture, more impressive for volume and significance than the temperance gain of recent decades; nor is there any lesson of dietetic experience more certain than the constitutional injury and the causation of fatal disease through intemperance in the use of meat, coffee, tea, and ice cold non-alcoholic drinks, not excepting water. As Mr. Brisbane put it in his Cosmopolitan Magazine* statement:

"Prohibitionists detest the idea that temperate drinking means

*A symposium in the May issue: Dr. Alison representing prohibition.

anything in the long run but final drunkenness in the majority of men originally temperate. And they believe that the man who remains temperate is the most harmful of drinkers, because he sets a bad example to others who lack his will-power, admire his strength of character, and imagine that they can safely imitate his habits."

Dr. Alison lays it down as incontrovertible that a man's power of self-control gives way under the effect of "the first glass," to at least some extent, and puts him in peril of indulgence in a second glass, and so on indefinitely. There is neither veracity nor validity in this representation. The wine, like all other gifts of nature, and the habit of drink, like other habits of the human animal, may be either harmless or harmful according as use and indulgence are temperate or intemperate, and on an immense scale experience has effectively taught moderation and lessened intemperate self-indulgence.

Dr. Alison's assertion that safety lies in total abstinence, while danger must ever be coincident with drinking, has no warrant in human experience generally, nor has Dr. Alison any just reason for declaring that "he who would be a healthy man cannot afford to ignore the doctrine of total abstinence"; that "the best scholars in this field say that alcohol is neither food nor fuel for the body."

"Sir Frederick Treves," says Dr. Alison, "the eminent surgeon to King Edward VIII., expresses himself as follows:

"It is said that alcohol is strengthening and that it gives great working power. We hear a great deal of this in the advocacy of British beef and beer. That sounds very well, but let us view the facts. Alcohol modifies certain constituents of the blood and, on this account and on others, it effects prejudicially the nourishment of the body."

In speaking of the effects of alcohol on the circulation, Sir Frederick states:

"Alcohol produces an increased heart-beat, a fuller pulse and redder skin. It **calls upon the reserve power of the man,** but the moment the effect passes off the action of the heart is actually weakened. Consequently the temporary effect is produced at an unfortunate cost."

Sir Andrew Clark, M. D., physician to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, expressed himself unhesitatingly as follows:

"Alcohol is a poison. The health is always in some way or other injured by alcohol; **benefited by it—never!"**

We have thus far spoken of the physical. Nor is the use of alcohol less injurious to the mental conditions. It is not sound doctrine that claims the use of alcohol is beneficial to high thinking. There may be **stimulus** at times, but there comes just as surely **reaction.**

Professor Huxley once remarked, "If a man cannot do brain work without stimulants of any kind, he had better turn to hand work; **it is an indication of nature's part that she did not mean him to be a headworker."**

Sir Benjamin Richardson wrote, "Of all men brain workers are the least able to bear up under the ravages of alcohol—this traitor who enters the most precious treasury, the citadel of the mind."

Perhaps the strongest argument that can be advanced for total abstinence is the argument from the standpoint of expediency. Paul remarks in one of his epistles, "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient. It is good not to eat fiesh, nor to drink wine, nor to do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth."

On this principle we may go absurdly and flagrantly wrong. to excess of ascetic abstinence fatal to all the best welfare of the race. Because "wine and women" have so commonly meant an abuse of the worst character, not less in vile association with degraded womanhood than in beastly indulgence in wine, we might reason, as so many ascetic purists have done, that the normal operation of man's relation to woman tends to evil so certainly and so invariably that no man can be safe who ventures even the least indulgence of natural appreciation of womanhood. Infamous as any such reflection upon human nature in its more refined, more elevating and pure form is, the like judgment of peril from wine involves not less falsification both of the facts of nature and of the counsels of scripture. Paul's view was drawn out by the custom of festal offering of meat and wine in the temples, the same to be consumed by the worshippers of the gods to whom the temples were dedicated. The question arose to some whether they could as Christians use such meat and wine, and Paul was unwilling to cause any who doubted of this use to violate their conscience. In the same way exactly we may avoid use or service of wine when we might thereby tempt any to their harm, but that does not mean a rule of abstinence, much less a law of prohibition. Paul's counsel to his younger companion in ministry to take a little wine for his stomach's sake reflects good Biblical principle in regard to "wine which maketh glad the heart of man."

WILDE'S BIBLE PICTURES. 114. H. HOFMANN. 1924—

BETHANY.

In the Christian celebration of communion in the second century, when principle and practice were at the purest and best ever known, the custom was for all who could to bring offerings of bread and wine for use not unlike that of our church suppers. The president, who became known as bishop, went through the audience to receive the offerings, four acolytes or assistants carrying a sheet into which loaves of bread were cast, and a deacon bearing a large bowl into which flasks of wine were emptied. In the earliest practice there was a considerable variety of offerings, but later the rule was to offer only grain and grapes in addition to bread and wine. When the offerings had been gathered they were consecrated by the bishop giving thanks, and divided into parts, some distributed at once and consumed on the spot, some to be taken away to absent persons needing charity, and some to other uses of ministry to special need. The wine just as much as the bread was received and partaken of as food supplying a common need. It may be said with the utmost confidence, that were the churches of our time to return to the communion usage of ministry to human need, on lines of the early Christian Eucharist and on an adequate charity scale, it would mean a very large use of wines of the proper kind, and of other food and medicinal stimulants.

There could be nothing more untrue than the assertions of Dr. Alison, Professor Huxley, and Sir Benjamin Richardson that alcoholic stimulant hinders mental activity, is not of use for brain work, and cannot be borne up under by brain-workers. It is wholly a question of proper use, which may be to cause sleep and put on the brakes, or to call out a reserve of power to which may follow reaction as the price paid for a temparary benefit, or to assist nature in the matter of digestion. It may easily enough be that "high thinking" will not come by wine, or brandy, or any stimulant, while yet brilliant expression, sustained energy of utterance, may be greatly helped by the right potion.

Sir Andrew Clark's opinion did not prevent regular daily use of whiskey by Queen Victoria, as a rest and strength potion. Her physiological record was stated as follows not long before the close of her life:

"Queen Victoria has never suffered from dyspepsia. She attributes this to her eating little, but often, and to her taking whiskey at meals. She drinks it clear, without water."

Mr. Gladstone's physician and Mr. Gladstone did not agree; the following press report is to the point of the physical condition of the great statesman:

"Just before he died Sir Andrew Clark said in an interview published in the British Medical Journal: 'The force, energy and versatility of Gladstone's nervous powers are far beyond those of an ordinary man in the prime of life. To him work is not exhausting, but restorative; it is his true stimulus and keeps him young and vigorous.' This explains how the 'grand old man' finds relaxation from the arduous labor of political leadership by writing books on Homer, magazine articles on Dante, and pamphlets on theology, in which he is said to be better 'up' than any other man in England, lay or cleric, and by learning an obscure and difficult language like Basque, just to while away the time spent for 'rest' at a watering place."

And as to Mr. Gladstone's practice, we may note his reason for refusing to join in a total abstinence movement. He said: "How can I, who drank good wine and bitter beer all my life, in a comfortable room and among friends, coolly stand up and advise hard-working fellow-creatures to take the pledge?"

It means nothing to any good purpose to assert against all human temperate experience that "alcohol is a poison pure and simple." Physical vitality is maintained by the inrush from the air of oxygen. That inrush will not take place unless there is just a trace of iron in the blood globules which go coursing through the capillaries of the lungs. The oxygen molecules catch on magnetically and travel to the tissues of the system, leaping out into a tissue cell wherever a magnetic condition favors this. If there is too much iron in the blood the oxygen will not let go and leap out into the tissue cell. It is the same for plants as for animals. The entire system of nature turns upon just the least little iron, a trace only, not too much. Because any excess does injury of the worst sort is no proof that the trace is not absolutely necessary.

Again, the oxygen of the air works with absolute precision as the breath of life. But oxygen pure and simple is corrosive, injurious, destructive. In the air oxygen is only one part in five, and the four parts are nitrogen, the molecules of which are more sluggish in motions, far less intense than those of oxygen. But for this modification of the intensity natural to oxygen by itself all animal nature would be burned, corroded, blasted, as by the most deadly poison. Yet with the actual conditions of nature oxygen plays its part as the breath of life. So alcohol, indefinitely injurious, poisonous in the worst way, as it may be, may play a beneficent

part on a vast scale once that we understand and conform to the necessary conditions.

It is a "tale told by an idiot" that under the proper conditions, in beer, wine, brandy, whiskey, alcohol is not a food, giving strength, a medicine working most important cure, a source of internal warmth of incalculable value for neutralizing the dangerous effects of chill, and in a variety of ways, to children, to young and healthy men, to women very commonly, and to the aged almost without exception, an agent of health and life, a blessing, rarely and deeply beneficent, and not at all baneful unless the conditions of proper use are disregarded.

It is to the last degree ignorant and absurd to make a scare with the word "poison," or, as Youmans did, with the words "death and decay." The largest and most incessant fact of the animal system, in man or beast, is the decay and death of living matter and the production of the worst form of poison. Of this poison any animal would die in a day if excretion were not operating on a scale in a variety of ways adequate to avert the peril. Even with alcohol in doses calculated to operate as a poison, the habit of excretion of the natural poisons of the system may very often meet the emergency and carry the alcohol out of the system, thus greatly mitigating its evil effect. An immense factor in modern medicine is the introduction of some poison, toxic cause of disease, the expulsion of which will carry out the like disease-causing poison. The art in such case is to give the right quantity in the right way. With like art temperance must control the use of alcoholic stimulants; it may be abstinence for many, perhaps even for the great majority. Hear, for instance, such testimonies as these:

Sir John Burden Sanderson, M. D., professor of physics in University College, London, while under examination before the House of Lords' investigating committee—which **our** Congress **refuse** our people—said: "My belief is that the race would be situated just as favorably if the use of alcohol did not exist. . In the first place, its evil preponderates over the benefits; and, secondly, that all its benefits are dispensable benefits."

Alongside of all this teetotallism there is an appalling amount of tippling that does not distinctly intoxicate, but saturates the principal organs, and destroys them more quietly than would an occasional debauch."—[London Lancet.

It was the mistake of my life, which I entertained but a brief period, that **beer** was beneficial to **anybody** under **any** circumstances.

I regard it not merely as worthless, but as **productive of a most diseased state** of the whole system, the worse that it is often not suspected until too late.—[Dr. Henry I. Bowditch, Boston.

Instances justifying such testimonies are not the whole story, never have been and never will be. They are not half the story: the preponderence of experience is unquestionably and decisively the other way, and the very great probability is that as use of stimulant drinks becomes intelligent, conscientious, and temperate some use will be common to almost all, even if to some any use at all is deleterious in the extreme.

Two conventions, of Brewers, and of trades allied with the brewing interest, came together in Milwaukee, Wis., June 9th, 1908, for a three days' demonstration against the "fool-fury" of the anti-saloon league.

At the opening of the Brewers' convention, the President, Julius Liebmann, made an address in which points of great importance were admirably presented. Thus President Liebmann said:

"In spite of the fact that our beer is universally pure and that the leading physiologists are so thoroughly agreed as to its food value, the brewer finds himself held up to obloquy and scorn, and in many states his business is in danger of confiscation. What is the cause of this clamor? It is, we believe, the fact that very few of the men and women who preach prohibition have any first-hand knowledge of the saloons. They do not enter them, even for the purposes of observation, and they certainly do not know that by far the large majority of saloons are decent and respectable, and do not tolerate drunkenness or disorder.

"It is of the utmost importance that the saloonkeeper should respect the laws, but the constant injustice meted out to him under the guise of laws, is force which tends to undermine this respect.

"The problem of the saloon is one of regulation by statutory authority; of administration by the trade. From either standpoint it is a complex problem which cannot be settled in the offhand fashion that seems so easy to superficial observers.

"The regulation of the saloon has been needlessly complicated by experimental legislation, party politics, police corruption and inefficiency. Fixed and arbitrary limitations, imposed upon communities by the State, without regard to local conditions, have only increased the difficulty. To keep the saloon out of politics, it must first be taken out of politics. And the best way to keep it in politics is to provide by local option laws for the constant agitation of the license question, with the element of harrassing uncertainty

which this involves. In recent years the saloon has been growing to be less and less a political factor. Today it threatens to become the biggest political issue in our history.

"With a situation of this character confronting us, and with our property interests involved, with the millions and millions of dollars invested under the sanction of the law, can anyone expect to remain idle while this property is being confiscated?

"It is our duty to hasten universal enlightenment and to spread the conviction that our industry stands for temperance in the best sense of the word, and will neither countenance nor tolerate anything that is not thoroughly in accord with the moral and physical welfare of the people."

The report of the board of trustees of the Brewers' Association made particular reference to aspects of the situation about which there can be no dispute by instructed observers. Thus it said:

"The special activities of this association mark a new era in the history of the beer business. The allied trades have not taken up this work in the spirit of mere defense. Their actions indicates their conviction that the industry to which they are so closely related is honest and legitimate.

"Thoughtful men in the ranks of preachers and writers are convinced that sumptuary legislation is most mischievous, and they are becoming more and more disgusted with the intemperate language and misleading statements of professional prohibitionists.

"The Anti-Saloon League has exploited the emotions of men; the professional agents of the league appeal to the passions and prejudices of the people, and inspire them with blind and intolerant hatred, which, translated into action, leads to anarchy and riot. In many cases the people have voted in haste, to repent quickly at leisure, and already efforts are being made in a number of states to secure amendments to the law, or a repeal of sumptuary legislation, now that there has been time for sober second thought.

"In the language of Bishop E. S. Lines of the Newark, N. J., diocese: 'Legislation which is unfair, which cannot be enforced, or which is sure to produce reaction, is unwise. It is not strange that people who have suffered in one or another way from the abuse of strong drink, or have seen its ill effects, should feel strongly and be ready to do that which promises restriction of abuse. But men are needed who are at once temperate in speech, thoughtful, wise and rightminded, to guide public opinion and to influence legisla-

tion. Temperance, like religion, has a great deal to fear from its friends.' "

"Men of clear vision and intelligence, whose experience has taught them to be worldly wise, are in common agreement upon these points:

"1. That the temperate use of alcoholic liquors is so widely spread as to be a national custom.

"2. That this generation of men and women is more temperate than any preceding generation in our history.

"3. That the abuse of such liquors, while comparatively small, is nevertheless a grave and to some extent an unnecessary evil.

"4. That practical remedies are now to be found in regulation, education, moral suasion, and in raising the standard of living.

"5. That the standard of living can best be raised by improving housing conditions, by liberal expenditures for public health, industrial training and recreation centers, and by reducing the hours of work and increasing the scale of wages of the unskilled laboring class.

"Inebriety—The failure of prohibition, whether in city, county or state, is conceded by all impartial students of government. The character and kind and places of drink are changed by prohibition, but none of these schemes which attempt to suppress or ignore the saloon have checked the evil of inebriety. They have simply driven drinking into secret channels where it is not under social control.

"The time is ripe for a thoroughly scientific study of inebriety and the adoption of a definite and comprehensive plan of dealing with it.

"The crux of the whole question is really this: Can the common use of intoxicants be prevented by abolishing their lawful sale? If not, the practical thing to do is to improve the system of regulating the places where they are sold, and to encourage the sale of these beverages which have the smallest amount of alcohol, while at the same time we continue the work of popular education along the lines of self-restraint and moderation in all things.

"Control, and not elimination, is the key to the solution of the saloon problem. In all thickly-settled communities the saloon is a necessary social institution. You cannot have a city without saloons. They may not be offiically recognized and licensed, but they are there just the same. There are, however, good and bad saloons; saloons that serve the reasonable convenience of the people in decent and orderly fashion, and saloons that are centers of social

disorder. There is nothing inherent in the saloon which need or should make it disorderly or disreputable.

"The best working solution for the social control of the sale of liquor that has yet been devised, is the licensing system. To be successful, however, the license must be so conditioned that it insures stability in the business, and compels the licensee to regard obedience to law and order as essential to the continuance of his franchise. A permanent, consistent and stable public policy, which deals justly and fairly with the saloonkeeper, raises the character of the business, and attracts to it men of responsibility."

National Model License League Proposals.

In the same direction with the endeavors of the Brewing interest to secure proper liberty of manufacture and trade under law at once reasonable and effective, the National Model License League, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky., issues the following declaration of principles:

We, The National Model License League, contend that the present license system is unfair to the retail liquor dealer; that it compels him to be active in politics and that it encourages by its provisions the violation of the law. Therefore we insist:—

First, that all licenses should be self renewing without the interference of licensing board or political boss and they should be transferable at will.

Second, that the number of licenses should be limited to not more than one for each 500 of population.

Third, that the cost of licenses each year shall not be excessive.

Fourth, that the penalties for violation of law by retail liquor dealers should be mandatory, and for the first conviction should suspend the license for thirty days, and for the **second** conviction **should cancel** the license.

Fifth, retailers convicted of the second violation of law should be prohibited from holding a license in the state at any time in the future.

Sixth, there should be a penalty for minors over eighteen years of age who undertake to secure alcoholic beverages by representing themselves to be of age.

Seventh, in dry territory the same penalty should prevail for the purchase or use of alcoholic beverages as for the sale.

Eighth, where **prohibition** carries, dealers, **distillers,** brewers **and** wine **makers should be compensated for investments** made under the sanction of previous law.

We favor FAIRNESS, CONSISTENCY, DECENCY and LAW.

Under the proper license the retail dealer will be, of all men, most anxious to obey law.

Mr. George G. Brown, Vice-President of the Model License League, points out in the following convincing statement the true situation under a recent prohibition enactment in North Carolina:

"It is true that the reports from the state indicate a majority of something like 40,000 in favor of prohibiting, not the use, but the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic beverages, excepting wines made from grapes and other fruits within the State, but it is not true that the people of North Carolina will surrender their right to use whiskey, beer or any other alcoholic beverage they may be disposed to consume.

These so-called prohibition laws which are being urged by the Anti-Saloon League are not intended to prohibit the consumption of alcoholic beverages, because it is an absurdity for anyone to contend that a law merely prohibiting the manufacture and sale of an article for which there is a general demand would put a stop to the use of said article. It is true of alcoholic beverages as of other commodities that as long as a demand exists that demand will be supplied from one source or another, provided the profit in supplying it justifies the risk of supplying it.

I do not hesitate to predict, therefore, that the consumption of alcoholic beverages in North Carolina in the future will be fully as great as it has been in the past, and the chances are that it will be greater, because the purchases will be by wholesale rather than by retail. We are all familiar with the fact that when a consumer buys cigars by the box he uses more cigars than when he supplies his wants from a cigar store as he desires to smoke, and the indisputable figures of the Internal Revenue Department show that this is also true in regard to beer and whiskey. The fact, however, that the people of North Carolina will continue to consume alcoholic beverages will be small satisfaction to the distillers, brewers, wholesalers and retailers in that State, who are despoiled of their property without any compensation by the vote cast under the influence of the Anti-Saloon League Speakers and writers. These properties, which, after the first of January, 1909, will be absolutely useless and will consist merely of brick, mortar and other material unfitted for any other purposes, will aggregate many millions of dollars, and

such confiscation must inevitably prove a great blow to the prosperity of that State.

The loss of revenue must also be serious, but, as suggested above, and as experience and common sense prove, there will be no reform, there will be no lessening of the consumption of alcoholic beverages, there will be no falling off in intemperance, there will be great demoralization throughout the State, and an additional burden will, undoubtedly, be placed upon the backs of the remaining taxpayers in the effort to enforce an impossible statute.

If these facts are true, then why did the people of North Carolina vote for a law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic beverages excepting those referred to above? In answer to this question I would say that this vote is largely an unreasoning one, due to excitement, and to an excitement in some cases wrought up to frenzy. It is also in the nature of a protest on the part of the people against the way in which many of the retailers of the State conducted their places of business.

In explanation of this I quote from a letter dated May 21, from Mr. T. DeQuincy Tully, secretary of the Law Enforcement Society of New York, who visited North Carolina at the instance of the National Model License League, and who made several speeches in that State in opposition to prohibition. Mr. Tully's society is for the sole purpose of enforcing the law, and on investigating the objects of the Model License League, Mr. Tully was so convinced of the soundness and practicability of its purposes that he has become an earnest advocate, as he sees through the league the only satisfactory solution of the liquor problem.

Mr. Tully, in reporting his observations, said:

"From what I could learn while in North Carolina, I judge the situation to be as follows: What may be called the 'sentiment' of the State, in common with the expressed sentiment of other sections of the South, is for prohibition. In North Carolina, while they have local option, and a large portion is already 'dry,' they have had no good restrictive regulation law. They have no liquor-bond nor State regulation. Regulation by the enforcement of the law is left to the local communities. All prosecutions are for crime, and of course are difficult of enforcement. The consequence has been that there has been practically no enforcement, or restraint on the retail liquor business. The people have been accustomed to observe the abuses arising therefrom, and the proposition to vote out the saloon seems the only remedy the people have to protect

themselves from the evils they have been in contact with year after year.

"The rebellion, for it amounts to that, against the legalized saloon, is the result of disregard on the part of the liquor men for the law, common decency, and the sentiment of the church and the moral people in the different communities in which such traffic is carried on, and is the result of conditions brought about largely by the saloonkeepers themselves, backed up by local politicians who desired the assistance of these men in placing and keeping them in office.

"While it is probable the State will vote 'dry,' yet it will be most unfortunate for the State if it will do so.

"I found the people do not understand the situation, or what they are called upon to vote for. They are led to believe they will vote for prohibition, where, as a matter of fact, they will vote for nothing of the kind. They really will vote for a law and for a proposition, and this law, the most iniquitous, unfair and un-American that could be devised, will be fastened upon the State, and it will be found most difficult to correct, no matter how unsatisfactory it will be found to work.

"In my opinion, the campaign of education was not commenced soon enough. It appeared to me too late to inform the people as to the real merits involved, and the folly of voting for the proposition presented to them, in the way it was drawn up. In my opinion, could the situation have been properly placed before the people, they would repudiate the measure. As a matter of fact, every person I talked with, when he understood the matter, was against it. The cry of the Anti-Saloon League, who have industriously placed the proposition of prohibition before the people through the churches and other ways, has caught the ear. They purposely left out any reference to the law which the people will fasten upon themselves when they vote for the prohibition proposition.

"I am fully convinced that your Model License League holds the key to the situation of the great question in the South. It may be difficult for you to have your plans adopted, but I see no other way.

"Fire-eating speeches on either side will do more harm than good. Threats of drastic laws, in case of defeat by either side, will only arouse the passions of the people. What is needed is a calm discussion of the question, and a united effort on the part of all good people as patriots in the most practical and satisfactory way, to settle the question by the licensed saloon and a strict enforce-

ment of the law. The extremes of prohibition on the one hand and lawlessness on the other will never solve the problem. I am more than ever convinced of the righteousness of your cause and the practical value of your plan."—Courier-Journal, May 28.

It has taken but a brief experience of prohibition at Atlanta to call out testimony to the economic and moral disaster which prohibition has proved to be,—the drink situation worse a good deal than it was before, and the costs to the last degree repressive of prosperity. The Memphis Commercial-Appeal had the following, under date of Atlanta, Ga., May 25th, 1908:

"Henry W. Grady, one of Atlanta's most prosperous and best known citizens and manufacturers, and son of the dead orator whose name is cherished throughout the length and breadth of the South, declares that prohibition is causing Atlanta to suffer an enormous financial loss. He says that the city is being drained of thousands and thousands of dollars, and asserts that it is time to call a halt.

In speaking of Prohibition in Atlanta Mr. Grady said yesterday:

"I believe in local option. I believe that Atlanta is big enough and good enough and wise enough to govern herself, and the people of this county should be given the right to say, at the ballot box, whether or not they want prohibition, and not have it forced down their throats by a lot of small counties in which conditions may be different.

'I am frank to confess that in the past I rather favored prohibition, in the hope that it might be of some benefit. But it has been tried here in Atlanta long enough to convince me, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that so far as Fulton county is concerned it is a miserable failure and a farce.

"I know that the so-called prohibition that we are now having has injured Atlanta financially and morally. I know that up to the time the present law went into effect we had a prosperous, moral and well-governed city, but I know that now thousands of dollars are being sent out of Atlanta every month never to return, and that our beloved city is suffering financially on account of this drain.

"I know that morally Atlanta has suffered and will continue to suffer so long as we have a law on our statute books that is not enforced, cannot be enforced and that apparently no effort is made to enforce. A law that I do not believe the majority of our citizens favor. I know, as every other man who will take the trouble to investigate must know, that the sale of whiskey is being conducted in Atlanta about as it was in the past, except that there are no regulations to govern it and no restrictions to curb it.

"As between conditions that existed here before the present law and the conditions that exist now, I say a thousand times over let us return to the old order of things and be done forever with such drastic and absurd laws, which are working against the commercial growth and forward movement of Atlanta.

"It is high time that the progressive citizenship of Atlanta was calling a halt. It is time that we demand our right to govern ourselves and grant every other county in the State the same right. There are scores of conservative business men who do not want the present miserable conditions fastened upon this county. I do not believe that the white voters of Fulton county want the present conditions to continue. I believe that they want and should have the right to settle this question for themselves, and that they are willing for every other county in Georgia to have the same right.

"I believe that the merchants, the farmers, the laborers and property owners want to see Atlanta money kept at home instead of having it going out of the State, as it is now doing. There are forces at work to elect men to the legislature from Fulton county who will fasten the present miserable condition upon Atlanta for another two years without even giving the citizens of this county the right to decide the question for themselves. They should not be elected. The interests of Atlanta are at stake. When prohibition is cast aside Atlanta will again be the prosperous, thriving city than she was a year ago, but not until then, in my opinion.

Mr. Grady declares that the last Georga legislature simply "run it" over Georgia cities. If the people of Atlanta, he says, had voted on the question the fortune that is now leaving the city monthly in the purchase of beer, whiskey and other alcoholic stimulants, would have been kept here.

There are thousands of progressive, respected and conservative citizens who do not mince words regarding prohibition. They declare that it is injuring Atlanta to a discouraging extent. They say that if the next Georgia legislature allows present conditions to continue that another slump in prosperity will result.

The Chamber of Commerce is just awakening to the fact that the city is being robbed of a stupendous sum monthly by the liquor interest in the far South, North and East.

It is estimated that the local postoffice is now issuing anywhere from $30,000 to $40,000 worth of money orders monthly to persons sending away for their drinks.

Conservative estimate places the money value of express orders issued monthly to liquor buyers at between $30,000 and $33,000.

And upon top of all this it is claimed that individual checks amounting to a total of between $10,000 and $15,000 per month go out of Atlanta in the purchase of beer and whiskey.

Business men declare that the express companies are raking in millions of dollars annually on shipments of beer and whiskey into dry territory.

Use of Alcoholic Beverages Increases With Prohibition.

The statistics appealed to by the Model License League show very conclusively that the period from 1893, when the Anti-Saloon League started operations, has been one of very large increase in the per capita consumption of Fermented Liquors, with a favorable effect in reducing or keeping down the per capita consumption of Distilled Spirits. For the years 1893-1900 the per capita consumption of Fermented Liquors was reduced a little from 16.6 gallons in the years '94-'99, and in 1900 stood again at 16.6. After 1900 the per capita steadily rose year by year to 22 (gallons) in 1907. In about the same way the per capita consumption of Distilled Spirits went down from 1.46 (gallons) in 1893 to .86 in 1906, and for the period of eleven years, 1897-1907, rose year by year to 1.47 in 1906 and 1.58 in 1907.

The figures for Distilled Spirits consumed declined from 97,-424,825 in 1893 to 87,087,618 in 1894; 74,176,239 in 1895; and 60,-635,356 in 1896; and after 1896 rose year by year to 97,534,139 in 1901, and by 1907 had mounted to 134,031,066,—a yearly average of more than 6 million gallons. For Fermetned Liquors the per capita figures declined a little in 1894, but rose part way back in 1895, and went higher in 1896 than the figures of 1893. For 1897 the figures were lower again than those of 1893, but took a great jump in 1898; then fell back a little for 1899. The 1899 supply was 36,581,114 barrels (1,750,595,648 gallons), against 34,554,317 barrels (1,105,738,144 gallons) in 1893. With the year 1900 the figures stood at 39,330,849 barrels (1,258,587,168 gallons), and they rose year by year to 58,546,111 barrels (1,873,475,552 gallons) in 1907.

Assuming a considerable effect for some years of the Anti-Saloon agitation, this effect does not appear in recent years. And whatever the effect was for a time, a great mass of evidence goes to show that anti-saloon, No-License operations have a singularly bad effect in causing consumption of Distilled Spirits when otherwise Fermented Liquors would be preferred. The beer product of the United States makes for temperance. At any rate, the claim is a

just one, that the people, with the progress of civilization and the improvement of manners and customs, gradually turn from the strong alcoholic drinks to the light ones; that in a great measure this is due to the excellence of American beer in appearance, taste and quality; and that, as Henry Watterson recently said in the Louisville Courier-Journal: "The introduction of beer to America has done more for temperance than all the temperance societies and all the prohibition laws combined."

The frequent attacks of the temperance people on the brewers and the product of their industry, the persistency with which it is classed as liquor, although it contains only from 3½ to 4 per cent. alcohol, and the incessant clamor for prohibition almost everywhere in the rural parts of our country, especially in the South, is in scandalous contrast with developments which have made the brewing industry one of the largest, most respectable, and most beneficient of the Industries of the World. From small beginnings the American production of beer has within half a century become one of the great industries of the country. The production of beer which was in 1863, the first year of record, only a little over two million barrels, had grown during the period 1860 to 1900 to nearly forty million barrels, that is, twentyfold, and with 1907 the beer production of the United States has reached the enormous quantity of nearly sixty million barrels. The employees of this vast industry, numbering in 1905 nearly fifty thousand, received an average wage of $718, nor far below the highest average earnings of wage workers (steel engravers at $753). In the making of our nearly sixty million barrels of beer, there is an annual consumption of nearly a hundred million dollars worth of American farm products. The tax paid to the national government alone on the brewery product is nearly $60,000,000. Into the channel of building, machine, and tool industries, during the period 1890-1905, the brewers of America poured nearly two hundred million dollars, and a further contribution to other industries of eighty million dollars within the ten years 1890-1900 must be put to the credit of the brewers. It is, indeed, a place of vast importance which beer holds in the industrial producing situation of America, and no endeavors of malignant fanaticism can materially affect it.

The medical world has long ago recognized the nutritious value of malt products, whether fermented or unfermented, but the latter, containing neither alcohol nor carbolic acid, lack the animating and refreshing qualities of the former. If the actual demand, the general craving of human nature and the experience of centuries count

for anything, the small percentage of alcohol and the carbonic acid in beer must be considered a valuable and essential constituent of it, whether considered as a beverage or an article of nutriment. Considering the diminutive quantity of alcohol in it, it seems unjust to class it with distilled spirits as intoxicating liquor.

Its extensive use by mothers and nurses with infants at their breasts is due to its nutritive and digestive qualities, as well as its palatableness, and physicians often prescribe it to them. It seems to be the best milk-producing food. It is also blood-producing and physicians favor it in cases of anaemia or blood poverty. Dr. William B. Fletcher, of Indianapolis, Indiana, while superintendent of the Indiana Hospital for the Insane, favored it very much for the anaemic insane. He regarded it as a valuable food on account of the starchy and saccharine constituents held in soluble form, rendering them easy of digestion and assimilation.

Dr. J. Mount Bleyer, of New York, vice-president of the American Congress of Tuberculosis, a physician of superior experience in the treatment of consumptives, said:

"In disease like tuberculosis (consumption), as well as in other diseases, the various cells of which the body is composed suffer from the poisons which are steadily being poured into the general circulation of the blood that supplies them with their food. Thus, these cells are killed or damaged, and the strength of the body becomes enfeebled. It is, therefore, necessary, in order to counterbalance this wholesale slaughter, to supply such nourishment which has the highest nourishing quality, to help to regenerate their loss and feebleness. Where the best beer can be taken and digested, there is no better food for the consumptive."

Dr. F. W. Pavy, Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, London, expressed himself as follows:

"Beer is a refreshing, exhilarating nutritive. A light beer, well flavored with the hop, is calculated to promote digestion, and may be looked upon as constituting one of the most wholesome of the alcoholic class of beverages."

Dr. J. E. Pilcher, Secretary of the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States, and first vice-president of the Association of Medical Editors of the United States, is of the opinion that there is a certain amount of nutriment contained in beer by reason of its organic constituents, and that its moderate use is not injurious to the health of adult persons.

Prof. M. A. Scovell, of Louisville, Ky., since 1885 chief chemist of the Pure Food Department of that State, expressed the opinion

that the solids contained in the average beer are to be classed as food, and that beer, where employed as a liquid food, does not tend to produce the habit of intoxication.

Privy Counsellor Dr. Ernst Zunker, physician to Her Majesty, the German Empress, says:

"It seems certain that beer, the mildest and most harmless kind of alcoholic beverages, is, if used in large quantities, injurious only by reason of the large amount of liquid poured into the body and not by reason of its alcoholic properties. All liquids taken into the body pass through the blood-passages and the heart, and most injuriously affect the heart, especially one that is not perfectly sound, if taken in too large quantities."

In closing this article, it might be in place to meet a widely spread prejudice that beer is frequently adulterated. A short time ago, the State Board of Health of New York, ordered an analysis of the ordinary American beers on the market. Of the 476 samples analyzed, all of them were found to be perfectly pure and wholesome.

In fact, there is, perhaps, no beverage which admits less of adulteration than the modern lager beer. Any foreign substance would either prevent proper fermentation or impart to the product a foreign taste. Imported beers sometimes contain a quantity of chemical preservatives, but domestic beers are invariably free of them. They may differ in quality, but never in purity. There is, perhaps, no class of food producers less affected by the new pure food law than the brewers.

Dr. H. W. Wiley, chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, in whose hands, to a very great extent, the enforcement of the new law lies. and who is preparing rules and regulations for it, defines beer as follows: "A beverage made by the alcoholic fermentation, in potable water, of barely-malt and hops, with or without unmalted cereals." He will strictly adhere to this definition, and will not even allow the use of sugar, unless its use is stated upon the label. Whatever prejudices may have existed as to the use of adulterants in the manufacture of beer, there is no justification of them under the pure food law.

Within the recollection of many now living temperance has made immense gains. In both public and private life drunkenness is considered disgraceful, and temperate men nowadays are given the preference in all walks of life.

What has caused this change for the better? Not prohibition

by law, but the raising of the moral status of the people through moral suasion and proper teaching.

There is no gainsaying that there is much harm done by over-indulgence in liquor, especially those of a spirituous nature, but prohibition will not lessen the evil, rather increase it.

Prohibition would no doubt seriously injure the beer and wine industry, but would stimulate the whiskey traffic, and thus actually prove harmful. Thousands that now satisfy the desire for a stimulant by indulging in the milder wines and beer, would take to the stronger stimulant because less bulky, and easier handled, including the smuggling and concealing of it.

There is more whiskey sold in prohibition Maine than in licensed Minnesota, both of the same area and population.

Another objection to prohibition is that it is class legislation of the most offensive character. It can only be made operative against the poorer classes. No law can be framed that would stand the test of the Supreme Court that would prevent a man of means from stocking his cellar and sideboard with all the viands he desired. The saloon is the poor man's club. Abolish it, and you drive him to the "blind tiger." The saloon can be regulated, the patron protected against vile adulteration, and the public against possible disorder, but prohibition never can and never will be enforced on American soil. It is a blow at personal liberty.

The editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal of Februatry 21, 1908, a journalist of the highest distinction,—today in fact the dean of American journalism—frankly lamented "the horrid example of Georgia and other States south of us, which have tried Prohibition to find it only a scheme of spoliation and delusion, uniting bogus religion with rotten politics, and replacing conditions that admittedly need reform by conditions tenfold worse.

Mr. Watterson had a few days before quoted Rev. Dr. Boyd Winchester, pastor of Grace Episcopal church, of Long Island City, as saying that he felt it to be his duty, as a minister and a citizen, to do all in his power to support a return to the license system, after a two years of "dry." He claimed to advocate license on moral grounds, and asserted that the "no-license plan did not remove the evil of intemperance, but exaggerated that evil and added to it many other worse evils, proving a prolific breeder of perjury, lawlessness and hypocrisy, all kinds of vile and poisonous concoctions being dispensed by irresponsible and disreputable persons."

"With admirable precision," Mr. Watterson continued, "Boyd Winchester says: 'Prohibition may close the saloons, but the fa-

vored classes can drink at will in their homes and clubs, while the multitude must resort to cellars, 'blind tigers,' 'secret joints' and hidden places generally, where adulteration and extortion prevail; the difference being that drinking will go on with unabated fervor, though under mean, furtive and demoralizing circumstances. Any form of Prohibition or restriction bears most heavily upon the poorer classes, the rich being always able to secure whatever potations they wish. No one can question the sincerity of Mr. Gladstone as to Temperance, but when urged to join in a Temperance propagandism in 1864, he wrote: 'How can I, who drank good wine and bitter beer all my life, in a comfortable room and among friends, coolly stand up and advise hard-working fellow-creatures to take the pledge?' "

"There is not a thoughtful, right-thinking man in the world who does not know that this is the truth, and bound, in the nature of man and the case, to be the truth.

"Cardinal Gibbons is the latest authority, and a very great authority he is, to be quoted to the same effect. The good Cardinal is firmly of the opinion that Prohibition does not prohibit. His idea that laws which are sure to be broken are bad laws, begetting disrespect for all law, cannot be successfully controverted. Only those who are very ignorant and unreflecting, or else victimized by emotional insanity, can think otherwise.

"The editor of the Courier-Journal received a letter not long ago from a good Christian woman in Central Kentucky, who was fairly horror-stricken that the paper, which she said she had held next after her Bible, should "oppose Temperance." She was able to see but one side of it. She only saw the drink habit with its devilish machinations; the saloon with its easy seductions; both to be extirpated by a statute, which would not, in our opinion, reach either, whilst entailing peculiar evils of its own; smuggling, adulteration, extortion, perjury.

"Laws to regulate the sale of intoxicants and increase the responsibility of liquor dealers, with a judicious and rational license system and a reasonable restriction, are wiser and more effective, and more likely to be observed and enforced whenever public sentiment approves them, than any prohibitory enactment. Local option laws, unlike prohibitory laws, do not confuse the wholly different issues of saloon regulation and personal abstinence, and do not impose upon communities laws which public opinion will not suffer to be enforced. Local option, constantly growing more carefully restrictive and stringent in supervision, aims, whenever practicable,

to draw the line between that part of the traffic which public safety requires to be prohibited and that part which, if evil at all, is too remotely and indirectly so to warrant an interference with individual rights."

"'It is a Democratic axiom,' says Boyd Winchester, in the spirit of Jefferson himself, 'that the best-governed people are those least governed; that the science of legislation is the science of touching as lightly as possible the freedom of the citizen in his individual, domestic and personal life. The mania for regulating everything does not spring from a Democratic root. It is characteristically monarchical to oversee all, to intermeddle with all, like an Argus with a hundred eyes and a Briareus with a hundred hands. The royal conception of government is that of a felt presence in the daily life of every citizen, directing his manner of life. This morarchical idea has been defined by writers on government from Aristotle down, and it postulates a sovereign power standing at the side of every citizen to see that he behaves. This is the direct opposite of Republican dream and ideal. The security of individual rights, the rights to life, liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness, and arbitrary restrictions, are a 'contradictions in terms, a blasphemy in religion, a wickedness in politics.' Providence has given to every sane human being a degree of reason necessary to direct himself in the affairs which interest him exclusively. On this grand principle civil and political society rests, and it has been the object of all the struggles against arbitrary power in every age, until out of dark and dreary struggle the great truth was established that, 'the only freedom which deserves the name is that of pursuing our own good in our own way, so long as we do not attempt to deprive others or impede their efforts to obtain it.'"

The drastic Prohibitionist, who is the lineal descendant of Cotton Mather, will have none of such reasoning. He wants to make his neighbor as himself, and unless his neighbor yields, he wants to kill him. The spirit of true religion is expelled by intolerance from the Churches, and then the hue and cry of hypocrisy in religion is taken up by unscrupulous politicians, and upon it are rung all the changes which pharisaism and perfidy know so well how to ring, in order to catch the ear of the unthinking, and palm off fraud on impressionable people for truth."

Revolt of Maine Against Prohibition.

Speaking of the resignation of Charles E. Littlefield, as Congressman from the Second Maine District, which he has represented

for nine years, the press reports announce that Mr. Littlefield retires because he can no longer successfully oppose the anti-prohibition sentiment in his state. In the last election Littlefield's majority was a scant 1,000 votes in a district which has a normal Republican majority of 6,000 votes. The issue was plain to all. Littlefield stood and stands, for the strict enforcement of the Prohibition laws; his opponent was an anti-prohibitionist.

This is in direct line with the published statements of former Sheriff William M. Pennell, of Portland, a candidate for the nomination for Governor of Maine this year, who has taken a stand squarely in favor of resubmitting the Prohibition amendment to a vote of the people and who declares that not only does Prohibition not prohibit, but encourages drinking of vile liquor and is responsible for the loss of large revenue to the state. Pennell is running on an anti-prohibition platform.

Littlefield saw the handwriting on the wall when he scrutinized the returns in the last Maine state election, in which the Republican majority was reduced from 20,000 to 7,000 on a Prohibition issue. He has wisely decided to get out of politics before the impending revolt against Prohibition puts him out. A Portland, Maine, dispatch of March 23, 1908, said:

"Representative Littlefield for a long time has been the head and front of the reactionary sentiment on the Prohibition question. He has openly supported the Sturgis law from political platforms in two campaigns, and this action alone resulted in 1906 in his re-election to Congress by barely a thousand plurality in a district where the normal Republican plurality has been for years in excess of 6,000.

"Throughout the State of Maine the agitation of a resubmission at the polls this fall of that section of the constitution which prohibits the sale of liquor is exceedingly strong, and it had become apparent to Mr. Littlefield and his friends that disaster would block his path if he sought to continue in the House of Representatives or in any other branch of Maine's political life without completely upsetting his publicly declared political principles.

"Of the two leading candidates for the Governorship this fall one—Sheriff William M. Pennell, of Portland—is an avowed anti-prohibitionist. The other, William T. Haines, is making his campaign on a resubmission platform. Governor William T. Cobb has expressed himself on more than one occasion in very forcible terms against the Sturgis law, which Mr. Littlefield has sought to uphold.

"This Sturgis law has perpetuated control of the state liquor

traffic in the hands of a few politicians by reason of the fact that the law gives to a state commission the practical policing of the entire state, as far as violations of the prohibitory constitutional clause and the statutes are concerned. Ever since Mr. Littlefield was sent to Congress, in 1899, as the successor of the late Nelson P. Dingley, his road has been a stormy one because of his attitude on the liquor question, and his resignation at this time is taken as evidence that, realizing the tremendous turn in sentiment in his state against Prohibition, he has bowed to the inevitable."

Prohibition Failure Confessed.

The "National Prohibitionist" of Chicago and New York, in its issue of January 9, 1908, quoting official statistics showing the revenue received from beer and spirits during 1906 to have been $199,035,913, and in 1907, $215,904,720, editorially makes the following comment:

"It seems to us that these figures teach, as clearly as anything can be taught, that the kind of prohibition which we have had up to the present time is not a cure for the drink evil, and does not even approach a cure. We are frequently told that many millions, perhaps a half of the population of the United States, 'live under prohibition.' The statement is true only in a very modified sense, and the showing of the article in question emphasizes its lack of exactness.

"In strict fact, no part of the United States today has real prohibition. The sale of liquor is forbidden in certain sections; the manufacture of liquor is also forbidden within limited areas. **The forbidding is made good so far as the manufacture is concerned** in the greater part of the so-called prohibition territory, and we begin to have considerable sections of the country where comparatively little liquor is sold, but the results of drink selling in the wider sphere of its influence still reaches the whole country."

England Legalizes the Saloon.

Under the above head the New York World reported the latest English situation in the matter of legal control of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages:

Chancellor of the Exchequer Asquith introduced into the English House of Commons on February 27 the government bill for the regulation of the liquor traffic. In this measure, the British government recognizes the rights of the individual in the retail purchase of alcoholic beverages and, what is equally important from

the standpoint of justice and fair dealing, the property rights of manufacturers and dealers whose business would be ruined by prohibition.

Mr. Asquith, in explaning the measure, said, among other things, that in his opinion compulsory Sunday closing was not advisable; but that outside of the metropolis no saloon will be allowed to remain open on Sundays for more than one hour at midday nor more than two hours in the evening.

The number of saloon licenses is to be based upon density of population in different districts. In cities it is proposed to permit one saloon for every 750 inhabitants and in the country districts one saloon for every 400 persons. But even this regulation is to be introduced so gradually as to be hardly perceptible. The Chancellor estimated that it would take twenty years to bring about the change in all districts.

The bill also contains a clause providing compensation for all persons who are deprived of saloon licenses under operation of the proposed law. This clause is to lapse after twenty years, when it is believed the new regulations will be in full force.

But even the modified Sunday closing clause is made so elastic that persons on a journey, or who have traveled as much as six miles, may obtain liquor or other alcoholic beverages during the closed hours on the Sabbath.

Another important feature of the measure is that which subjects all clubs, those of millionaires as well as those of the poor man, to annual registration and to frequent inspection by government officials. This places the rich and the poor on an equal footing, so far as the sale and purchase of liquor is concerned.

The value of the clause which provides compensation for persons deprived of licenses under the operation of the law may be estimated when it is known that the capital invested in licensed property in Great Britain is not less than $1,200,000,000 while more than 2,000,000 people are employed in the liquor traffic.

This is the most comprehensive measure ever introduced into a national legislature. It has regard to every phase of the liquor question. It provides ample regulation of the traffic, safeguarding the consumer as well as the non-consumer; giving liberty of choice to the individual, removing all discrimination between the rich man who goes to his club for a drink and the poor man who goes to a saloon, providing compensation for persons deprived of property rights and obviating the necessity of deception and perjury in obtaining a drink, as is necessary in Maine and Kansas.

Hugo Munsterberg, Harvard Expert in Science, Condemns Prohibition.

"Munsterberg on Drinking: He Denounces Prohibition as Impracticable: Declares Dr. Williams's Statements Illogical: Careless Misinterpretation of Isolated Experiments: No Proof that Alcohol Cuts Off the Power of Mental Production: Examples that Prove the Contrary: Legislation that Goes Ahead of Popular Sentiment a Grave Danger."

Under the above headlines the Boston Transcript of November 10th, 1908, gave a press report of an address by Hugo Munsterberg in Philadelphia. In regard to the alleged evils Prof. Munsterberg admitted considerably more than the facts require, and then went on to say, in regard to "the means by which these evils can be removed in the highest possible degree without introducing other evils equally calamitous."

"After studying this problem for more than twenty years and after repeating frequently in the psychological laboratory all the significent experiments, and after curing scores of drunkards by psychotherapeutic means and thus being near to the question all the time, I am fully convinced that under the present conditions of American life the only wise way of reform is by working toward temperance and not toward prohibition. It must be a campaign of education towards a moderate use of light alcoholic beverages.

"Since I uttered this opinion publicly a few months ago in a popular magazine, a whole literature of so-called replies has gone up. There was no lack of vehemence and an abundance of misstatements, and even the excitement of the presidential campaign would not be sufficient to excuse the denunciations and falsifications which my friends, the prohibitionists, indulged in; but I looked in vain for a single argument which could change in the least my opinion. Of course, I do not deny that the other side has a much simpler remedy. To exclude all alcohol from this country by prohibition laws seems to get rid of the evil with one stroke; it needs indeed much less effort than a true education towards temperance. But the prohibition movement is just like the free silver movement in economics, or like socialism in politics, or like spiritualism in religion, or like Christian Science in medicine, or like Pragmatism in philosophy. They all contain a little core of truth, but their truth is old and they become new fashioned movements only by new sensational formulations which appeal to the unthinking crowd. But just this always secures at first an immediate cheap victory; a super-

ficiality of thinking prevails in the world and can never resist the enthusiasm of fanatics.

"Let us not forget that we want to legislate against a physiological desire which belongs to a majority of men. The absence of this desire in women or in a large number of men whose nervous system is differently organized can easily mislead. I personally, for instance, brought up in a temperance household, have had my life long a physiological dislike not only for strong drinks but also for beer. But in planning for the millions I should feel reckless and irresponsible if I simply generalized my own chance constitution. I have no word against the so-called restriction of personal liberty; I do not know a right to personal liberty if it interferes with the common good, but the more I must demand that this common good is determined by the careful observation of the real facts.

"That kind of abstinence legislation which prevails in certain parts of the country and is evidently near in others is surely not for the common good. That it destroys industries and makes hundreds of thousands breadless and that it deprives millions of a harmless joyful feeling is still the smallest harm which it produces. But far more important is the disrespect for law which it creates. Prohibition puts a premium on the systematic violation of law and produces a form of corruption which is still worse than the corruption which irradiates from the licensed saloon. Further, it reinforces drinking in its most miserable and dangerous form. The moderate drinker is cut off, while the immoderate drinker is created. It abolishes light wine and beer; and opens wide the way for the worst kind of whiskey. To fight intemperance by prohibition means to substitute one evil for another. A reform by slow education towards a moderate use of light wine or beer, with complete abolition of the present saloon and of the present disgusting habits, is the only way to permanent success.

"Of course there are not a few who are convinced that alcohol is ruinous for everyone, even in moderate quantities; and it has become the fashion to support this belief by the results of scientific investigations. My whole life belongs to science, but after most careful study I am convinced that there exists no scientifically safe fact which demonstrates evil effects of a temperate use of alcohol by normal adult men. Every claim on the one side has been disproved by just as important experiments on the other side. Even on Physiological ground, everything is uncertain. Dr. Williams of New York tells us that alcohol is never a food; and Dr. Dana of New York, the president of the New York Academy of

Medicine, tells us that alcohol is always a food. Dr. Williams writes that alcohol always lessens the power for work; and Dr. Dana writes that, as proved by recent experiments, alcohol has no effect, one way or the other, on the capacity to work if given in moderate daily doses. Dr. Williams writes that alcohol is the greatest evil of society; and Dr. Dana writes that the immediate removal of alcohol from social life would lead to social and racial decadence.

"Dr. Williams and so many others dogmatically assure us, for instance, that alcohol cuts off the power of mental production. But is really a psychological laboratory necessary to demonstrate the hollowness of such general statements? I know scores of men who never produce better than after a moderate use of alcohol, and it is well known that this is true in exceptional cases even where immoderate use is indulged in. I had to hypnotize only recently a well known New York author whose secret trouble is that he has never written a page of his brilliant books but after intemperate use of whiskey. Dr. Williams assures us even that every moderate use of wine and beer reduces the power of intellectual activity; and again the psychological experiment is said to have proved that. I must think there instinctively of the man who has given to the world the methods of psychological experiment, Professor Wundt of Leipzig, the greatest living psychologist. He is seventy-six years old today; has written about forty volumes, which are acknowledged the world over as the deepest contributions to psychological thought; has written this year an epoch-making book; and yet has taken for sixty years, twice a day, beer and wine with every meal. I attended last summer a number of international congresses and saw there at many banquets the leaders of thought from all nations. I watched the situation carefully, but did not discover any abstainers among the sharp and great thinkers of any nation.

"To demonstrate that the abstainers enjoy clearer methods of thinking than such drinking scholars would be indeed an interesting experiment, but from the prohibitionist literature I cannot gain the impression that clearness of thinking is their particular strength. Typical of their unclearness is the way in which they draw arbitrary consequences from the real experiments. It is, for instance, quite right to claim that alcohol makes our mental associations slower, but they interpret it as if that means a destructive crippling of our mental life. They do not even ask themselves whether or not this retardation of association of ideas may not perhaps be a most helpful and useful relaxation of certain brain centers. With the same logic they might demonstrate to us that sleep is a most ruinous

invention of nature, as it paralyzes our brain centers still more: and they have not the slightest understanding for the fundamental fact that such an inhibition in certain parts of the brain belongs to every single act of attention. They do not take the trouble to ask whether or not our associations are also changed through the digestion of a dry meal.

"With such careless misinterpretations of isolated experiments I could demonstrate to you most easily that every hour of physical exercise is ruinous for the higher mental life; or that the fatigue from the hearing of one hour's lecture makes mental cripples out of all of us. The fear of those who want to cut off a bottle of light beer with the evening meal from the home table of a hardworking laborer on account of the psychological experiments is wholly absurd."

President Eliot on No-License.

President Eliot of Harvard, at a grand rally of the Massachusetts No-License League, in Ford Hall, October 29th, 1908, attempted an apology for the culminating hypocrisy of his career in accepting No-License leadership, when, up to seventy-five years of age, his example has been that of a moderate drinker and his stand has been against prohibition. A Herald press report said:

In Ford Hall, last evening, in the presence of a large audience, drawn thither to a conference of the Massachusetts No-License League, Pres. Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University, honorary president of the league, not only occupied the chair and directed the oratory, but made one of the most notable addresses of his life.

Having been a moderate user of alcoholic beverages in the form of wine and beer during most of his life, and positively opposed to no-license as being an infringement of personal liberty, his views on both sides have undergone a radical change since the no-license movement was first agitated in Cambridge.

He now holds to the position that "alcohol in very moderate doses diminishes the efficiency of the working man," and that "the habitual use of alcohol in any form is lowering to the intellectual and nervous power."

Facing a large banner in the hall which bore a sentiment uttered by himself—"No-license is best for all the people of a community"—he gave a full explanation of the change in his own position and opinion in a lengthy speech in which he said:

"I ought to apologize to this audience for having consented to serve as honorary president of this organization.

"I am a very late comer to this cause and I see before me veterans in it who have given many years of ardent service to the cause. I feel that one of them should be standing here.

"But I have accepted the somewhat urgent invitation to this function from gentlemen who have been for many years laboring hard in this no-license cause.

"I want to explain a bit why I have been so late a comer, because I think that my reasons might possibly influence a number of persons who have not yet joined this cause.

"I was not in favor of no-license in Cambridge when it was first proposed.

"I have been all my life what is sometimes called a moderate drinker.

"That is to say, I have used beer and wine on occasion, not habitually, and I never experienced any ill-effects whatever in my own person from either beer or wine.

"I recognize the truth of the Bible saying about wine, that 'it maketh glad the heart of man.' That is true.

"Whether it be expedient or not that the heart of man should be made glad in that way should be doubted. (Laughter.) But there is no doubt about the fact that wine or spirits will momentarily make glad the heart of man.

"I have recognized the fact that alcoholic drinks have a tendency to cheer the people up and make them jolly and noisy, but the question of expediency of that kind of elevation has gained on me as the years have gone on. It seems to me that the recent researches in physiology and medicine tend very strongly to show that the moderate drinking of alcohol is inexpedient.

"For instance, one old theory is now absolutely abandoned. As a result of experience it is a fact that men who are to be exposed to cold or heat or hardships of any sort are not prepared or braced for such encounters by any form of alcohol.

"No captain of an ocean liner ever supports himself now against the terrible exposures of the bridge by means of alcohol. He will take hot tea or hot coffee or hot lemonade, as I have seen many of them do, but he never takes alcohol to stimulate him when exposed to terrible weather. It is so in regard to most intellectual labors.

"It was not expected that anybody encountering the labors of the prime minister of England in his office every night and during the long hours of the day could do the work without being sup-

ported by one or two bottles of port a day; and many famous men have lived through that sort of life under those conditions.

"That view is absolutely abandoned. It is well known that alcohol, even if moderately used, does not quicken the action of the mind or enable one to support mental labor. We have had a great deal of German investigation and some American investigation in psychological laboratories in that direction, and the results are perperfectly plain, and they are all one.

"For instance, a clerk has as his principal function the addition of figures, in long columns or short. If the clerk drinks in the day a moderate amount of wine or beer it is demonstrated that he cannot add as well the next day as if he had no alcohol the day before. That has been proved by actual experiment in a very large number of cases, so large as to establish the fact. It is established as a psychological fact, the result of experiment.

"The effect of alcohol on the time reaction of the human being has been studied carefully, tested in hundreds of thousands of cases. and there is no question about the ill effect of alcohol even in very moderate doses on the time reaction. That means that alcohol in very moderate doses diminishes the efficacy of the workingman in most instances, makes him incapable of doing his best in the work of the day.

"So I say that the recent progress of medical science, largely accomplished through animal experimentation, has satisfied me that even the moderate use of alcohol is objectionable; that the habitual use of alcohol in any form is lowering to the intellectual and nervous power.

"Now, if a man be leading a purely animal or muscular life. I will say, he can perhaps feel no evil effect from this drug, but if he is leading an intellectual life, if he is engaged in an action which interests him keenly, stirs him, impels him to the use of his mind, then he will inevitably feel the slowing effect, the deteriorating effect of this drug.

"Now, I was brought up as a youth and as a young man as a student and teacher of chemistry, an exact science, and I was taught to believe in nothing so much as the open mind, and I felt that exact observation and just inference were the foundation of that kind of knowledge which should determine conduct.

"And so I have tried all my life to keep an open mind, particularly on burning questions, and I suppose that is the reason why, as I have grown older and seen more, I have changed my view about license and no-license. I feel as if much had been proved that it is

physically and mentally and morally for the advantage of a population as a whole to go without alcoholic drinks, as a rule.

"But then I was brought up in my youth, in church and school and college, to believe in human liberty as the only condition for developing human virtue or anything in the human being that deserves the name of virtue, a self-sustaining, self-controlling principle. Isn't it a great interference with liberty, with the liberty that God gives man, to undertake to prevent people who want alcoholic drink from getting it? What is the justification of that interference with liberty?

"I have somewhat changed my mind about that since Cambridge first tried to establish the practice of no-license. I thought 21 years ago that a poor man in Cambridge had as good a right as I had to get some beer or wine—I always hated distilled liquors—when he wanted it. What is the justification of interference with that liberty? He often needs to have his heart gladdened—needs it more than I do. What is the justification of that interference with liberty?

"There are a good many questions today concerning which we must ask that question—the justification for interference with liberty. I found that justification in the experience of Cambridge under a no license system. It seemed to me that the collective good, by excluding saloons from Cambridge, justified the abridgement of the individual liberty, particularly when that liberty was a liberty to use for pleasure something that was unwholesome.

"I see that there is a sentence up there attributed to me (pointing to a banner on the wall). I don't remember when I said or wrote that, but it is a fact. I have found in that fact the justification for interference with individual liberty to that extent—the exclusion of the saloon.

"I was asked just now at this table whether I would go further and say that I would advocate a complete exclusion from Cambridge of liquor in all forms. I have not got that far yet—perhaps I shall. (Applause.) But I have not arrived at that yet. That would be to me putting too great an interference on individual liberty.

"I do not observe that the human race has been so placed in this world that temptations to evil are absolutely excluded. It seems to me that many temptations are allowed to exist, and that men are allowed to yield to them, but when I see a great collective good accomplished at the expense of the loss of a trifling or unimportant individual liberty, I am reconciled to that amount of interference with liberty. (Applause.)

"But I just said that we have been obliged to consider interference with individual rights in many directions of late. The reason is that this massing of population in small areas, crowding, driving together in an unwholesome manner, has brought a large number of new problems into society; and then nature herself is showing us that in many ways we cannot pit ourselves against natural evils on the individualism principle.

"We have learned in Cambridge that it is possible to exclude the saloon absolutely from a city of 90,000 inhabitants, and have no alcoholic substitutes therefor.

"I didn't believe that years ago. I had seen something of prohibition in Maine, and I knew that the prohibitory law was a dead failure in that state—a dead failure. A saloon may be excluded—it often is not in a Maine city—but assuming the saloon to be excluded, under prohibition law you will always have numerous illicit places of sale.

"Now, I supposed a no-license law in Cambridge would work in that way, but an experience of 20 years has proved that that is not a necessary result. Cambridge has no saloons and it has no illicit places of sale to speak of.

"So you see, ladies and gentlemen, that I have had some reasons that I can state for changing my mind on the subject of no-license, and I would like to state here in order that they may perhaps fall under the eyes of my many friends who have not yet changed their minds on no-license. There are a good many of them. There are a good many moderate drinkers whose support for no-license is still essential to the success of that policy.

"The no-license policy of Cambridge was at first effected and has been long sustained by the votes of men who are moderate drinkers. It is just so today. It is probably so in almost all no-license towns and cities of this commonwealth. Still I believe that it is desirable to carry these men further, just as I have been carried further, and to procure from them a downright genuine support of no-license for its own sake, that is, for the good it does to all the men, women and children."

The testimony of experience of use of beer and wine for a life-time cannot be neutralized by a lurch of senile degeneracy, under motives and upon reasons so absurdly inadequate as those alleged in the statements quoted above. It has been, not the glory only but the misfortune, of President Eliot's career, that he has been a conspicuous figurehead far beyond his actually demonstrated worth in any respect whatever. The strength, purity and charm of

his character constitute a nobility admirable to every eye, and, with breadth of intelligence suggestive of ample culture, it has been most easy for him to win universal esteem, respect and applause. Harvard University, moreover, under whatever developments, is a stage to merely tread which, as the elect of a constituency almost unexampled for wealth of talent, may readily have a transfiguring effect. Then the vigor of self-confidence so pronounced in Dr. Eliot, and his address with men of the world, have given him comprehensive push and efficiency as a practical administrator, but in no direction of science, scholarship, or instruction, has he been a factor in the educational developments of the new age of inquiry, of research fruitful of new knowledge, and of experience and thought leading to reformation and prophetic of revolution. The late Ralph Waldo Emerson spoke from a great height of intellectual distinction when he said:

"Beware when the great God lets loose a thinker on this planet. Then all things are at risk. It is as when a conflagration has broken out in a great city, and no man knows what is safe or where it will end. There is not a piece of science but its flank may be turned tomorrow; there is not any literary reputation, not the so-called eternal names of fame, that may not be revised and condemned. The very hopes of man, the thoughts of his heart, the religion of nations, the manners and morals of mankind, are all at the mercy of a new generalization. Generalization is always a new influx of the divinity into the mind. Hence the thrill that attends it."

The forty years' opportunity of Dr. Eliot has known no thrill suggestive of a thinker let loose among the absurdities, the superstitions, the iniquities and cruelties, of a most imperfectly developed civilization. More, in fact, than any historical character that can be named, President Eliot has had command of a stage set by those before him for issues of unexampled significance, yet has he done nothing effective for elevation of the great cause committed to his charge. On the contrary, what he has done, bearing upon education of broadly effective character, has had a sadly lowering effect, working for mischief, depression, and defeat of high aims, to a degree without a parallel at any great crisis of human developments. That Harvard has gone on and gone up, in sufficiently phenomenal fashion, creates an appearance behind which are no corresponding realities of adequate instruction given, and ample results secured, in men equipped by knowledge and discipline for immediate efficiency in church, or school, or state, or commerce, or domestic and public society.

It is but too easy to note the loud acclaim of splendid success of President Eliot in magnificent developments at Harvard, but, none the less, on these mid-November days of 1908, the historic scene which Harvard presents, her students and her graduates of the Eliot period, is that of a volcano of vulgar passion, the "fool-fury" of athleticism, at a level of savage scrimmage and base sport, suggestive a good deal more of the Roman circus than of Christian culture. That such an economic, moral, and physiological ulcer as Harvard has opened under Dr. Eliot, should be not only permitted but promoted under commonwealth educational law, with vile contamination of all schools and of universal society, is an appalling revelation of evil far beyond anything due to or connected indirectly with the saloons of the entire State. Children may not drink where liquors are on tap, but in places of filthy scrimmage even the young girls may become drunk with hoodlumism, and every vicious venture in vulgarity of sport the young women of the colleges are left, not to say lured, to emulate.

Inexplicable as ignorance in all the great studies is, at all the great universities of the world, the one surpassing failure to know, and to act upon knowledge, is that of the athletic plague epidemic all over the American continent, upon impulse of scandalous misapprehension of facts and miscarriage of purpose at Harvard. If the purpose is that of culture the principle should be that of courtesy; in no case that of competitive struggle. Violation of this fundamental law of culture, so admirably conceived and acted on in Greek education, has gone to an extreme more than warranting energetic repression by commonwealth law. No want of human society is more serious than that of thorough education of the human animal and human mind to self-restraint, peace and good will. The hypocrisy of it which somewhat holds men back from brutal slugging does not meet the demand.

Physical culture requires knowledge of the facts of bodily organization, and of physiological function, which bear upon the question of exercise. In the first place, the brain, nerve centers and nerves, are the real man for doing anything, either bodily or mental, and the muscle-system is a mere harness within which the brain and nerve system operates.

In the second place, the muscles consist of muscle fibres which are sacs of tough substance filled with soft, cream-like substance, and the play of force from the nerves operates on this soft substance.

In the third place, the blood, carrying oxygen from the air to

all parts of the system, carries in the energy which gives the vitality and power to act of the system, and what we specially need for physical quickening, invigoration, and strength is, the reception into the lungs of the greatest amount of oxygen. We in fact breathe electricity, a heavy charge of which all oxygen carries, and when great power of muscle is developed it is by action of electricity on the soft substance of the muscle fibres. Development of brain, nerve centers and nerves, and of the soft substance in muscle-fibres, gives the fundamentals of physical culture, for the full benefit of which are required a good state of the blood and abundance of inbreathed oxygen. Light exertion meets the need; walking, for example.

In the fourth place, all excess of muscular exertion tends to extreme injury just in proportion to the amount of muscle that has been developed. Not only is "beef" not wanted for physical culture, but it is an undesirable and dangerous development, for the reason that chemical action in the system is constantly operating to produce a volatile poison, the essence of putrefaction, and any excess of exercise causes increase of this poison beyond the power of the system to excrete it. No man can take the excess of exercise required in training for, and in carrying through, competitive athletic games without great risk of accumulation of poison sufficient to prepare the way for typhoid, rheumatism, grippe, or pneumonia. This peril is greatly increased by taking cold, and as all persons without exception have a normal amount of this poison in their flesh all the time, and the one great cause of disease is the checking of excretion of it by taking cold, the way in which every November, immense numbers of persons are exposed to several successive chills, is a most deplorable depression of the public health, resulting ultimately in a very great number of deaths. It is straining at a gnat yet swallowing a camel for President Eliot to put up the bar against use of stimulant drink, yet suffer the outrage upon culture and the disaster to human well-being which the Harvard system of competitive sport is and always will be.

The economic crime ought to be suppressed by public law, a flood of money for a spectacle of brutal scrimmage, while a vast tide of human wretchedness flows unchecked, because benefactions to judicious charity are so scant and stingy.

At the highger level, where in matters germaine to education, President Eliot is assumed to have rendered memorable service, adequate inquiry and competent judgment will point to failure on his part, the scope and character of which are to the last degree deplorable,—the disaster and scandal of our culture for the last quarter

of a century. I am prepared to go fully into particulars, to show by indisputable facts, that the system in use at Harvard under President Eliot has had none of the results in any direction of education in the sense of requirement of absolutely essential studies, and of instruction in those studies. Some twenty-five years since, in a review of "Religion at Harvard," I pointed out the utter failure in the direction which was of supreme interest to the founders of Harvard, and Professor Peabody led an attempt to assassinate me for calling attention to the real facts. The failure which I then noted remains, with notable manifestation in Professor Peabody's singularly blind attempt to make moribund theology keep the field against the new humanism.

It so happens that the second worst failure at Harvard is in the field peculiarly President Eliot's, that of chemistry, and I challenge the opportunity to show that in this field the ignorance, credulity, and indifference dominant at Harvard (and Yale and Berlin) signify a failure to the last degree disastrous and disgraceful; and this in spite of the facts that Professor Josiah P. Cooke made one study in the right direction, in his "New Chemistry," and that Professor Trowbridge is a highly competent teacher of electrical facts knowledge of which promises a complete revolution in our science of the universe and of nature.

If space permitted I could show a wide sweep of studies attention to which should be required by any adequate scheme of real education, while at Harvard the practical result under Eliot has been **no attention to these studies.** In the book which has been published very recently President Eliot's statements in regard to his scheme of education are as able as they are confident, but not onee does this great master of Eliotism lift his eyes to the advances in knowledge which are the headlights of human progress; and at a great Harvard banquet held within a week in Boston the appearance was that Harvard primarily stands for an athletic system which is as rascal with low motives and methods as it is ruinous, through physiological ignorance, to physical culture.

The damnation of Dr. Eliot's career, for one of its aspects, is in an administrative and institutional success not less phenomenal than his own, if not overtopping it, as much as the Eddyite Temple in Boston is monumental above the Stadium. Respectable instruction in science and scholarship at Harvard during the last forty years would not have left Peabody and Fenn a very poor second to Mrs. Eddy.

It counts for very little that President Eliot, sitting as chair-

man of No-License zealots at a conference in Ford Hall, a Baptist centre of uninstructed culture, went through the hypocrisy of allegations too flimsy for serious notice.

In sniffing at the justice of Bible counsel and giving to "maketh glad the heart of man" the vicious twist as though the Bible said "maketh jolly and noisy," the trick no doubt answered the purpose of pious guffaw by the Baptist zealots.

The assertion that "recent researches in physiology and medicine tend very strongly to show that the moderate drinking of alcohol is inexpedient," not only lacks validity but it lacks veracity, on the part of any man respectably informed. Even if the assertion were true, instead of scandalously false, that would be no reason for limiting any man's freedom in the matter. And as a matter of honest fact there is no possible warrant for the assertion. It is made on the ground of exceptional experiments most inexcusably misunderstood. Of course strong and well men on duty amid extreme perils will not venture a dram liable to overcome their waking sense, but none the less great numbers of persons under killing exposure to cold may be saved from the sleep of death by a good dose of brandy; and a captain coming off duty after exhausting watch may be greatly benefitted by the stimulus of whiskey.

Talk about "time reaction" is nothing to the purpose except in special cases, which leave a vast number of cases in which the alleged effect is precisely what is wanted. But be the alleged fact as represented in Dr. Eliot's special plea, it carries no warrant whatever for laying down a dogma, or imposing a rigid law denying freedom to those who think differently. If Dr. Eliot has been recently satisfied that "even the moderate use of alcohol is objectionable," and that "the habitual use of alcohol is lowering to the intellectual and nervous power," it can only be because ignorance of incontestable facts permits him to put up a flimsy hypocrisy against the life-long experience to which he confesses.

There is a lower depth of amazing slump to unveracious and invalid testimony when Dr. Eliot undertakes to shield by scandalous sophistry the pretence that the greatest good of the greatest number justifies the monstrous denial of the representation that freedom favors temperance, and the still more monstrous assertion of right to make the use of freedom criminal. Dr. Eliot transgresses beyond all decent claim to judge, when he says, "I see a great collective good accomplished at the expense of the loss of a trifling or unimportant individual liberty." It was not in the exercise of

either human sympathy or conscientious respect for truth that Dr. Eliot found himself able to say:

"I found justification for interference with liberty in the experience of Cambridge under a no-license system. It seemed to me that the collective good, by excluding saloons from Cambridge, justified the abridgement of the individual liberty, particularly when that liberty was a liberty to use for pleasure something that was unwholesome."

It is not any such liberty, any more than any other liberty in diet, and it is sheer falsification to pretend the "unwholesome" character of stimulant food. The "collective good," moreover, is a mere hypocrisy, a form of temperance without the fact. Bishop Potter used a far better judgment when he said:

"The history of the enforcement of a mere rule has wrought in the temperance reform precisely what it has wrought in any other great movement,—it has produced formalists, but it has not been fruitful in virtue. It cannot be denied that the growth of the consumption of substitutes for things against the use of which prohibitory laws are aimed has risen side by side with the prevalence of those laws; and the observation and published statistics of medical men in states where such laws have obtained opens a chamber of horrors into which I have no heart to ask you to enter." ("The Drink Problem," pp. 10, 11.)

"I am sent here of God, if for nothing else," said the good, brave bishop, "to tell you how superficial, how utterly inhuman, inconsiderate, and unreasonable I regard a great deal of that zeal which seeks to make men and women virtuous and temperate by a law of indiscriminate repression; and to entreat you to discern that most of our methods for dealing with the drink evil are tainted with falsehood, dishonored by essential unreality, and discredited by widespread and consistent failure." (p. 20.)

ook should
n or before

3 2044 010 722 718

ve cents a day

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

WIDENER
BOOK DUE
JUL 1983
CANCELLED
APR 1 6 1983

CANCELL
BOOK DUE-SS FAC
AUG 11 1990

WIDENER
AUG 1991
BOOK DUE